DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 491 SO 010 196

TITLE Ad Hoc Conference of European Ministers with Responsibility for Cultural Affairs. Oslo 1976, Report of the Conference.

INSTITUTION Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).

PUB DATE 76

NOTE 161p.; Report of Ad Hoc Conference of European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs (Oslo, Norway, June 15-17, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Art Expression; Citizen Participation; Conference Reports; Creative Development; Creativity; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Enrichment; Cultural Environment; Democratic Values; Futures (of Society); *Government Role; Mass Media; Needs Assessment; Participant Involvement; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; *Social Change

IDENTIFIERS *Europe

ABSTRACT

The report contains 39 speeches by cultural affairs ministers at a 1976 Council of Europe conference in Oslo, Norway. The focus is on four themes: (1) the challenge of cultural policy in a changing society, (2) cultural policy as an instrument for improving the quality of life, (3) encouraging artistic creation, and (4) European cultural cooperation. The conference dealt with topics such as nonmaterialistic values, definitions of culture, commercial exploitation, cultural policy as devised by various governments, cultural statistics, industrial mass culture, international cultural relations, European cultural heritage, and amateur versus professional values in cultural affairs. In the closing speech, the Norwegian Minister of Education identified the major contribution of the conference as one of consolidation of the desire for cultural cooperation among European nations. The ministers presented eight resolutions aimed at ensuring stronger and more coherent cooperation in European cultural affairs through increased governmental support, stimulation of individual cultural development, dissemination of information, and coordination of cultural policy with policies in other sectors of social life. A list of participants and an index of speeches are presented in the appendix. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Ad Hoc Conference of European Ministers With Responsibility for Cultural Affairs

ED142461

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OSLO 1976
REPORT
OF THE CONFERENCE

50 010 196

Council of Europe
Strasbourg
1976

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction to the Conference 7

Speeches made at the Opening Session:

— Mr K. Egeland, for the Norwegian Government 11

— Mr G. Kahn-Ackermann, Secretary General of the Council of Europe 15

— Mr Karasek for the Committee on Culture and Education of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe . . . 19

— Mr Pouchpa Dass for UNESCO 21

Discussions:

Theme I — "The Challenge to Cultural Policy in our Changing Society" 23

Theme II — "Cultural Policy as an Instrument for Improving the Quality of Life in Town and Country Communities" 57

Theme III — "Encouraging Artistic Creation" 83

Theme IV — "European Cultural Co-operation" 107

Final session 131

Closing speech 143

Resolutions of the Conference 149

List of participants 163

Index of speeches 175

INTRODUCTION TO THE CONFERENCE

The ad hoc Conference of European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs met, following the invitation of the Norwegian Government, in Oslo from 15–17 June 1976. The conference was attended by the Cultural Affairs Ministers of the States signatory to the European Cultural Convention: the full participants thus comprised not only the 18 member states of the Council of Europe, but also Spain, Finland, the Holy See and Portugal, which has signed the Convention in February 1976. Liechtenstein participated as an observer. The Secretary General of the Council of Europe was Secretary of the Conference.

The Oslo Conference was the first occasion for the Ministers with responsibility for cultural affairs of the member States of the Council for Cultural Co-operation to compare problems of cultural policy in relation to their shared acceptance of democratic values.

The political importance which the Parliamentary Assembly attaches to the formulation of policies aimed at the cultural development of all members of society increased the interest of the Conference. Thus the Assembly's Resolution No. 624 on the democratic renewal of the performing arts was taken into consideration.

Before the Conference, participating Ministers were invited to submit draft resolutions to the Conference, and such drafts were received from Finland, France, Sweden, Turkey and the United Kingdom. In addition, Denmark submitted a resolution during the Conference.

The draft resolutions referred to above, together with background papers prepared by the Secretariat, the reports prepared by the Council for Cultural Co-operation and the Ministerial speeches, provided the background material for the discussions in the groups which were formed to discuss each of the four themes of the Conference.

1. "The Challenge to Cultural Policy in our changing society"

2. "Cultural Policy as an Instrument for Improving the Quality of Life in Town and Country Communities"
3. "Encouraging Artistic Creation"
4. "European Cultural Co-operation".

The Minister also noted the reports of other intergovernmental organisations which work in the cultural sector, either wholly or partly in Europe and, in forming the resolutions, noted the need to avoid repetition and duplication of work in these bodies.

The Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe commissioned four special reports as its contribution to the work of the Conference. These books are:

"Towards Cultural Democracy" by J. A. Simpson

"The Demystification of Culture" by Finn Jor

"Public Aid for Creation in the Plastic Arts" by Raymonde Moulin

"Cultural Policy in Towns" by Stephen Mennell.

*
* *

Note on this report

In preparing this report, the Secretariat considered it impossible to reproduce all the speeches made at the Conference and selected about half the addresses given. These were submitted to the governments concerned for approval and comment. The following texts are based on the results of this consultation.

Not all the speeches were delivered by the Ministers themselves, it having been accepted at the beginning of the conference that delegates representing the Ministers might be permitted to speak on their behalf.

The speeches are published in the order in which they were presented; revision and editing have been limited to adapting spoken addresses to printed texts.

While considerable appreciation was expressed by all the delegates, on behalf of their Governments, of the Norwegian Government's generous hospitality as hosts of the conference, such remarks have been omitted from the printed texts in the interest of brevity.

*
* *

OPENING SESSION

Opening Address by Mr Kjølv Egeland, Minister of Church and Education, Norway

Mr Secretary General, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me, on behalf of the Norwegian government, to welcome you all to this ad hoc Conference of European Ministers responsible for cultural affairs.

I am also very happy that the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr Georg Kahn-Ackermann, is attending the Conference to which the Council is giving such valuable assistance by serving as its secretariat. My sincere welcome goes also to the observers present, representing the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, and to certain European countries not members of the Council of Europe, or signatories to its cultural convention. Welcome also to observers representing other international organisations engaged in cultural co-operation, and finally, to representatives of the mass-media.

The presence of observers is a useful reminder that the official name of the Conference does not imply that this is the first occasion for the governments represented here to take part in international conferences where cultural co-operation and national cultural policies are being discussed. Indeed, some of the Ministers present here today have memories of earlier conferences of this kind. Some stand out as milestones on the road towards fuller international co-operation as well as towards the creation of national cultural policies designed to meet the demands of our societies of today and tomorrow.

We hope, of course, that this conference will prove to be such a milestone. The follow-up work after the conference will be mainly decisive for that, and should therefore be given careful attention. The work done beforehand by many competent groups and persons is of lasting value and importance – that much we know before we start on the conference itself.

The themes of the conference reflect a common European, indeed a universal, situation. We all know that society is changing so rapidly and so radically that we sometimes feel we simply cannot cope with development itself. Also, we feel that we do not like this development in all its manifestations. What then can we do to frame our own conditions by way of cultural policy? Here is an enormously important challenge right under our noses – and we shall deal with it in Theme I.

The challenge is to make life better for more people. Can we do this through cultural policy? Theme II is concerned with this. "Improving the quality of life" could mean nearly anything, and will always depend on the tongue talking, the eyes looking and the ears listening. The main point in the present connection is that we raise the problem of quality of life as a political question – and we do it in theme II.

The formation of a society where human quality is woven into all possible and relevant fields and corners of society is truly a political issue. And this means that the problems of human values be brought in as a main political issue of our times.

By proposing the encouragement and support of artistic creation as a specific theme, we know – and we make known – that here is a key word to the understanding of, and participation in values particularly connected with the quality of life. Art alone is not culture – we all know that. But certainly art **is** culture. And art is more than things of beauty. Art is a way of understanding and interpreting man and man's condition – and we shall fight with these problems under Theme III, still as a political problem, that is, as a question of political obligation to support the creation and performance of art.

Many words will be spoken, I presume, about cultural democracy or the democratisation of culture. We all want it. We all talk about it. We all hold it to be a first priority political goal. But what is it?

Cultural democracy is – broadly speaking – the creation of conditions for everybody to establish a personal relationship with Shakespeare and Beethoven and Rembrandt and all the rest. But it is more than that. Cultural democracy is the way to find opportunities and initiatives to play one's own flute in life. Cultural democracy is, further, to understand and accept other values than one's own. It means personal activity. Certainly too, it means to live with dignity and consciousness. And that means to live socially. But at the same time, life is a lonely affair. And culture is part of life. So culture is often a very personal thing, individually gained and appreciated.

Cultural democracy is having a hundred blossoms bloom. Different blossoms, yellow, blue and even ridiculous blossoms – but blossoms, nonetheless.

One of my hopes for this conference is that we should agree on, indeed insist on, the right to experience non-material values in a changing society as a common human right. A second hope of mine is that we may accept and affirm the vast versatility in the field of human values, often called culture – accept and affirm this as a fact as well as a moral and a political right.

Thirdly, I hope that we, as politicians, will agree on and stress an obligation to further these goals by all possible means, and accept the costs they imply, but refrain from converting into dogma the values we want adopted.

I shall not venture to define or explain what this means: but I will say a word of what it does not mean. Not being dogmatic does not mean that we cease to discriminate on the ground of quality, for we should see the danger of nihilism in these matters. Beauty and truth are not greater or smaller in proportion to their number of supporters. A piece of art is still a piece of art even if I personally do not like it or understand it. As I said, I shall not go into a discussion of this, but what I have in mind is, of course, among other things, the vulgar and ruthless exploitation of bad taste, often seen and feared in modern commercialised entertainment. I also have in mind exploitation of anti-intellectualism and irrational hatred of, for instance, arts and research. Those phenomena are there all the time, and we should be aware of them. We should especially rally to the defence of the most defenceless targets for commercial exploitation, namely the children.

No, I shall not define "quality". But it is there all the time.

My final hope is that our discussions, our resolutions and our recommendations will be more pragmatic and practical than philosophical and academic.

Personally, I see no conflict between individual activity and amateur culture on one hand and high regard for, and official support of professionalism on the other. The two should go together and mutually inspire each other. Indeed, for many people it is a process of highly demanding mental activity to take part in a theatre performance, listen to a concert, read a good piece of fiction, and I, for one, should very much resent to be told that by so doing, I am passive and thus inferior.

But what is **culture** – **really**? Not an after-dinner pastime for affluent people. Not social therapy. Not that which comes after everything else. Culture is – well, it's a matter for politicians.

The fourth and last item on the agenda is about European cultural co-operation. The countries represented here have a common ground, consisting of a common cultural heritage to which they have made important contributions and which contain some of the finest achievements and traditions of humanity. Their present-day cultural life is based on this cultural heritage and therefore has more or less the same structure, the same common ground, in all the countries. And, this cultural life takes place and is being conditioned by surrounding economic and political systems, which, even if they are far from identical, have important common features and ideas.

This being said and stressed, let me add with all due emphasis: we are not the world. Our European cultural co-operation is not an alternative, but a supplement to cultural co-operation within other frameworks, global or regional.

Finally – and again – I wish you much welcome to Oslo, Norway's capital, to consider a topic which may well be called the most important of our times – that is the question of a better life for man.

Address by Mr Georg Kahn-Ackermann, Secretary General of the Council of Europe
(Extracts)

I should like to begin by most cordially thanking the Norwegian authorities for hosting this first Conference of European Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs. Your gathering is indeed a significant development: so far we have had under our umbrella many meetings of Ministers of Education, but today's Conference fills a gap, as it allows for the first time in the history of the Council of Europe the politicians responsible for Cultural Affairs to meet and exchange ideas and, it is hoped, to agree on guidelines on cultural policies to be implemented both at national level and within the Council of Europe and the Council for Cultural Co-operation.

Many of you, like me, will share Mr Egeland's opinion that it is almost impossible to define culture in precise terms. One of the documents of our organisation describes culture as "everything which enables the individual to situate him or herself vis-à-vis his environment, his society and his heritage; all those factors which contribute to a better understanding of man's position and destiny and make it possible for him in given circumstances to modify them". The dynamic and evolutionary element embodied in this description is very interesting and highlights the difficulties of talking of a European cultural identity. Europe comprises many different cultures, and this variety makes our common cultural wealth. When formulating policies in this respect we have to take into account the differences of quality and quantity of the cultural heritage and life in the many regions and provinces of Europe.

The Council of Europe is characterised by its devotion to those spiritual and moral values which are the common heritage of the peoples of our member states. Culture and the Arts are, of course, both especially relevant in this context. I have already had the opportunity to say how difficult it is to assess what culture actually

means to the citizens in member states. The individual's access to cultural goods will, no doubt, be a key issue in your discussions. I, personally, have always been very interested in both the problems which confront the European citizens as participants and consumers of culture, and in the status of the inventors, the authors, and producers of cultural goods in our society. What does the individual expect when he takes up a book, looks at a painting or goes to the theatre, cinema or ballet? I suggest that his feelings and his expectations are of a fairly complex nature. I do not know whether the word "Schaulust", which in my mother tongue – and not only according to Sigmund Freud – has the double meaning of desire to watch and pleasure in watching, is of help in this context, but it is possibly the essential motivation of those enjoying performing arts – and, of course, Greek philosophers state that being entertained in itself forms a cultural value.

Modern society is faced with a situation where there is a dramatic confrontation between culture as a product to be consumed by the masses, and the so-called elitist approach, where the few who are initiated enjoy a deliberately sophisticated performance, or works of art. One of the essential questions which should at least tentatively be answered by your Conference is, therefore, the relationship between art and genuine cultural development.

In our societies, the cultural responsibility of individuals, and their freedom to choose what forms of culture they may wish to pursue and enjoy, exists in principle. Nevertheless, modern civilisation, with its often despotic impact, very often makes a mockery of this right and confronts us with the nightmare of a society of TV watchers of third-rate programmes. This is where the issue of the role of the state comes in. We well know that in states governed by different political regimes from ours, certain arts benefit from a top priority as regards subsidies. Hardly anywhere in our member states can it be imagined that 3,000 people a night would be able to attend a most grandiose performance by the Bolshoi ensemble for a nominal admission fee.

In line with our statutory philosophy, the Council of Europe tries above all to uphold individual freedoms and, therefore, can only endorse and promote state subsidies of the arts if all the guarantees for the individual's freedom of expression are granted – we should not lose sight of this aspect.

But we must remain aware of all the risks involved in a situation where true artistic creation appears to be the preserve of a cultural elite and where the rest of the public has little option but to consume

the conformist and more or less vulgar products dictated by commercially motivated fashions.

An essential point in implementing cultural policies is to obtain the participation of citizens. Inside the system of freedoms and fundamental rights in which we believe, the state can only be a guarantor of civilisation but not of culture. It is for the citizens to take into their own hands the cultural destinies of their communities. The discussion which will take place here on socio-cultural community development will be most interesting as it will, in particular, also allow for an exchange of views on the problems of the quality of life, of which culture is an essential element in our modern world and in particular in present day urban environments – and of course the scale of the urban problem is gigantic, its dimensions manifold, its components complex.

Cultural policy as devised by governments is usually a compromise between the taste and the needs of the majority of citizens and the dynamic trends of a minority of creators and others. There is nowadays a tendency to give priority to the cultural life in towns and regions. The CCC has dealt extensively with the problems of socio-cultural community development. Of course, some of the larger towns in member states are in a position to devote considerable money to animation projects and to the establishment of regional cultural centres, but we should be fair and take into account that culture should also be accessible to the rural population and the inhabitants of peripheral zones and small communities. The role of the mass media and in particular the role of radio and television in this respect should be reviewed, a task in which a few years ago, the Parliamentary Assembly's cultural committee set a good example. Democracy calls for the confirmation of citizens as individuals in their social, cultural and geographical surroundings. In this respect, the support which central authorities should grant to regional cultural manifestations play a vital role. Regional cultures are threatened everywhere by pseudo-cultural fashions, promoted in a few capitals. At the same time, new cultural developments are questioned and belittled as they seem to appear subversive. But is it not true that man, who in every situation wishes to be able to ask questions about himself, about his life and about his society, ultimately puts these questions to the politicians? This link between cultural life and politics is a permanent one and we all know that when the life of a community or a nation is at stake, the intellectuals are among the first to join the resistance against invasion and tyranny.

Another important problem is the protection of the artistic performance as such. International conventions, as well as legislation in some of our member states, indeed provide for some legal copyright protection of the artist's performance, of the creation of the individual interpretation by an actor of a certain role, of choreographers, and so on. But more often than not works of art and historic performances remain unprotected and therefore do not yield to their authors the well deserved benefit which basically gives them their means to live. I am indeed aware that the Convention signed on 26 October 1961 in Rome, under the aegis of UNESCO and the Berne Union protecting the rights of artists and performers, in particular as regards radio and television productions, provides some of the answers to this problem, but unfortunately not many of our member states have ratified it so far.

Public lending rights is another aspect of this problem and I was gratified to read about the concern expressed by many British MPs on this matter in the recent debates in the House of Commons. Progressive legislation in the Federal Republic of Germany, Austria, the Scandinavian countries and the United Kingdom take care of the artists' and authors' interests, in particular by guaranteeing them a share-out on the royalties of their public performances and on radio and television broadcasts as well as on public libraries. I also ought to mention the case law in France, which grants the protection of "droits voisins" of copyright, or the anglo-saxon notion of ancillary rights. I submit that there is a case for an initiative from your conference, through the Council of Europe, to embark our member states into an effort of coherent European co-operation and legislation in this field. In short I think, though I know this is regarded very critically in many administrations, that this conference should recommend a new effort in harmonising the copyright laws and all the legislation protecting intellectual properties among the member states of the Council of Europe . . .

Address by Mr Franz Karasek Chairman of the Committee on Culture and Education of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

A glance at the conference agenda shows that it agrees and corresponds with the concerns and difficulties which have exercised the Assembly over the past year: we have a great deal in common as regards topics and objectives. The Secretary General Mr Kahn-Ackermann, has already mentioned that in the spring we held in Athens, through the kind hospitality of our Greek friends, a symposium on the future of the performing arts. I am grateful to Mr Kahn-Ackermann for drawing attention to Resolution 624, which we adopted in the Parliamentary Assembly last May with this meeting of European Ministers of Culture in mind. The basic idea and theme of our symposium and our resolution was the democratic renewal of the performing arts.

When we speak of democratisation of culture or of democratisation of the arts, we mean primarily the need to make the arts and culture accessible to all sections of the population. It is frequently held that it is wrong to confine art to an elite, so that only this elite might enjoy it. And so one of the basic considerations, which I believe is as important to you as to us as representatives of the legislature, is how to ensure that all sections of the population share in culture, including those who hitherto have not had access to it. However, I quite agree with what the Chairman said in his opening address, that democratisation of art is something more than this process, it is a matter also of stimulating individual cultural activity.

The question of the democratisation of art is closely bound up with the question of how to make sensible use of our leisure time which, as a result of shortening working hours, is continually increasing.

This leads on to other considerations: how to encourage people to use their increasing leisure time for cultural activities, how to persuade them to regard culture as a worthwhile leisure activity, and in this chain of inter-related questions, we come to the role of the school. Fortunately, it is increasingly felt that education and culture are inseparable, and that the school nowadays has a function to perform in introducing people to art. The next point we must realise is that the state has a paricular role to play in this whole process and not just that of providing money, to which it has frequently been confined hitherto in the cultural sphere. The state indeed ought to play the greater part in making cultural creativity possible, but with the important reservation that it must not itself control art. It must play its part in such a way that freedom, which the Council of Europe regards as so important in many spheres of life, prevails also in the field of art and culture.

So we reach the further set of problems concerning the artist's participation in the formulation of cultural policy as a whole. This is a relatively new idea, over which there is still hesitation in many states. In the past the state confined itself to the role of providing funds and subsidies, so that the question hardly arose, except on the political level. The artist's participation in this decision making process has therefore not yet become accepted practice in our countries.

People are indeed now beginning to ask whether it is not the duty of the state to make some provision for the artist's material welfare, and to provide him with social security as is done for other sections of the population.

To return to the financial aspect, the state has today become a patron in many fields, that is to say we have all become patrons. When I say all of us, I mean the taxpayer and especially the anonymous taxpayer who makes funds available for cultural activity, without himself enjoying it.

I come from a country, Austria, which spares no efforts in this field. Just to enable our four state theatres to put on daily performances, the Austrian taxpayer has to fork out some 3 million schillings a day, to cover the deficit. I am not against allocation of public money in this way, but by mentioning it I would like to emphasise the responsibility falling upon those who allocate the money and to make it clear that the state's responsibility is toward those who provide the money, that is to say the taxpayer, all of us . . .

Address by Mr E. Pouchpa Dass, Observer from UNESCO

I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to convey to such a distinguished assembly the greetings and best wishes of Mr Amadou-Mahtar M'bow, Director General of UNESCO, and to greet this city of Oslo, the capital of a country which does so much for the cause of peace and security in the world.

Quite apart from the excellent and effective relations which unite the Council of Europe and UNESCO and the complementary nature of our respective activities, the invitation extended to the Director General to be present at this meeting was felt as a gesture of esteem and trust.

The similarity of the vocations and the pursuit of common objectives account for the co-operation spontaneously established between the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

Never has the importance of this co-operation been more evident than at this time, when we see relations between industrialised powers exposed to profound changes which, just as much as the advancement of developing countries, call for the establishment of a new international order as the only way of substituting harmony and justice for the law of the jungle and the chaos produced by national selfishness.

However, this co-operation must not be limited to the work of our two institutions. International organisations do not constitute entities in their own right; they are essentially, as their name implies, instruments, that is, instruments to inspire, co-ordinate and, where appropriate, support the actions of their member nations. The problems, resources and the machinery of decision to be found are allocated on the national and sometimes even the regional level and it is there that our respective activities must be located and demonstrate their profound solidarity.

This is why a regional organisation like the Council of Europe, where parliamentarians play an important role, can give practical effect to the results of the process of reflection which an international

organisation like UNESCO tries to promote on a world scale with regard to certain aspects of the future of our civilisation.

I would merely like to recall the notion recently unknown or only vaguely apprehended, of cultural policies, related to the cultural aspect of development, the encouragement of artistic creation and the improvement of the quality of life and also the various international instruments drawn up under the auspices of the organisation, to mention no more than these few examples.

*
* *

Europe can legitimately be proud of having given birth to potentially universal cultures, which remain perennially fertile far beyond its frontiers. These European cultures, however old their roots, are far from having exhausted their vigour.

Quite on the contrary, everywhere there has been a burgeoning of research, critical enquiry and creative innovations which bear witness to what appears to be an inexhaustable fertility. And beyond their diversity, these cultures evidently constitute a common civilisation, which has brought together the peoples of Europe . . .

By virtue of its constitution and composition, UNESCO is always aware of these truths in their infinite variety and unfailingly, against wind and tide, makes use of its capacity to use what is best in the various nations to establish connections between them and draw them closer together.

For this reason a conference of the Ministers of Culture of the member countries of the Council of Europe is in the eyes of UNESCO a major event whose consequences could be considerable not only for the member countries of the Council but also for the rest of the world, which is observing and listening.

Your agenda promises much, as do the excellent documents prepared for the occasion. The four themes of discussion, which are of course of prime concern to your countries, are at the very heart of UNESCO's interests, that is, of those of the whole international community.

The conclusions you reach will no doubt inspire the delegations of your countries at the next general conference of UNESCO, this autumn in Nairobi, and will thereby influence the aims of the organisation in the field of culture . . .

Please allow me, in conclusion, once again to express our attachment to common ideals and the most fervent wish that your work should meet with every success and arouse the widest interest.

THEME I

The Challenge to Cultural Policy in our Changing Society

Introductory address by Mr B. Zachrisson Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs, Sweden

Sociologists are sometimes valuable colleagues in our cultural policy work. They help us to map out the reality we want to change and they measure the results of our reforms.

In the rich storehouse of cultural statistics that we have at our command there are some facts which have riveted my attention, in particular those describing people's reading habits and their ways of relating to music. Investigations show that nearly every Swede devotes 2–3 hours a week to reading. The weekly time spent on reading is about the same for everybody. There are differences of reading habits, of course, but these do not consist in how much one reads but rather in what one reads. A similar pattern holds true for music. The well-educated are admittedly more diligent concert-goers than others. Blue-collar workers are not seen so often in the concert halls. But they listen to music, especially the programmes broadcast on the radio. When it comes to private music-making, many a white-collar worker likes to tinkle the piano. The blue-collar workers for their part prefer the accordion and the guitar.

To my mind, these small observations, so plain and self-evident in themselves, pose a real challenge to us as cultural politicians. For us, they exemplify that all people need the possibilities for the experience and expression given by a cultural life. Just how that need is to be met will depend very much on each and everyone's upbringing and situation in life.

These observations remind us of the risks that accompany a traditional cultural policy, one that conserves a society where different groups diverge widely in their capabilities for taking part in the national life and are therefore isolated from each other and easily come into conflict with each other.

The data which the sociologists give us about people's reading and music-listening habits are important background material when we are called upon to decide what policy we shall pursue to achieve a higher degree of equality in the cultural sphere. To a very great extent, the ability of people to take part in the cultural life is determined by:

- the social environment they have grown up in;
- the education they have received;
- what part of the country they live in;
- the economic sources they command;
- the conditions they have at their workplaces;
- their leisure activities.

The prospects for a broad participation in cultural activities are of course not solely created by the reforms we make in the cultural sphere. Of equal importance are:

- the guidelines along which we build up our school system (as was mentioned by Mr Karasek);
- the opportunities we offer for enrolment in adult education;
- the planning of the new residential environment;
- the legislation for working hours and vacations;
- the conditions of the working environment and the influence employees are permitted to exercise over their own work situation.

But perhaps a little crudely, cultural policy can be said to be much too important a matter to be entrusted solely to cultural politicians.

In Sweden, we are endeavouring to turn our modern society into a welfare society, one where all people are guaranteed employment and good living conditions, help when they fall ill and security in their old age. Welfare policy forms an integral part of man's emancipation process. In this process, the fight for cultural democracy is a self-evident ingredient. Social security is not worth much unless it gives us guarantees for human growth and development. Security in old age is a good thing, but we cannot enjoy it without bitterness if we are forced to feel that we could never realise our innate potential during our active years, were never given the chance to express ourselves on, and affect, our own situation. Our modern society is caught in the midst of never-ending transformation, a rapid process in many respects. We invoke new technologies to help us. The industrial development keeps on rolling. New communities spring up and the human condition changes, but so does the scope which allows people

themselves to assume responsibility for, and bring an influence to bear upon, the social development.

In many of the countries that are represented at this conference, a lively debate has been waged in recent years about participation in management and decision-making in private enterprise.

All those who strive to extend participation in the decision-making process to the employees come up against this question: does an ordinary manual worker really have enough knowledge and experience to be able to assume responsibility for a company's management? That question admits of only one answer: anyone who dedicates his labour to the best interests of his employer – day after day, year in and year out – has important pictures of reality to contribute to a discussion on the running and development of the company. The workers' experience must, then, be interwoven with a knowledge of broader economic and technical complexes to which they should have access.

The steps taken in my country, as in some others, towards increased workers' participation were promptly followed up by an intensive study campaign amongst union officials, mounted and sponsored by the wage-earner organisations. Swedish workplaces have long been the venue of a massive study programme which focuses especially on improving the basic learning of the lower educated. All the patient work of helping people to improve their command of their native language, to train themselves to express their opinions and to understand public and business affairs has been combined with more colourful cultural ingredients which whet the imagination and impart momentum to the debate.

In their new plays, theatre groups capture topical aspects of the working environments and trade union work. Many of our travelling exhibitions deal with problems of the working environment. The harnessing of amateur theatre to the union cause is a subject we can study on the display panels in the lobbies outside conference rooms. Artists have taken employment at workplaces and taken part in production, after which they have contributed to the debate by expressing their experiences in pictures.

In this way, cultural policy is directly harnessed to the task of expanding economic democracy. People who formerly did not dare speak their minds are now joining in public debate. The objective of enlarging freedom of speech may be realised when such a cultural policy is developed within the employment sector. As I see it, these

are the uppermost goals for cultural policy in our changing society: to protect freedom of speech; to create the conditions for using that freedom; to broaden the opportunities for its expression, so that new groups may make themselves heard in the debate. If our society is going to evolve as we wish, many people will have to commit themselves actively to creating the future. The European society abounds in possibilities. We have fantastic technical resources at our command. The question of how these are to be tapped cannot be left (exclusively) to the increasingly specialised technicians.

It is a matter for urgent concern throughout society. Economic development is leading towards greater integration both within and between countries. Counterweights are needed to stem the rising tide of commercial forces. Multinational commercial companies have at their disposal much more efficient instruments than we as politicans have in our international co-operation.

There is a risk that we attach importance solely to the instruments at our command, and that we do not pay enough attention to the forces in cultural life which are beyond our control. Free international co-operation also gives free scope to those whose collaboration in the distribution of cultural products is primarily commercially motivated.

We all know what influence these products can have:

- They expose us to attitudes and standards which directly counteract the democratic development of our society.
- They can result in a passivity contrary to the political goals of participation and activity.
- They affect the socially and culturally disadvantaged groups more seriously than others – especially the children, as was pointed out by our Chairman in his opening speech.

We are all aware of these risks and that commercial powers may prevent the development of qualitative criteria. This awareness must be reflected in our discussions on the strategy for cultural policy in our different countries.

If our countries are going to endure, and continue developing as open societies, we must provide scope for an intensive debate where trenchant criticism can be levelled at all those who wield power and influence, and where there are guarantees for the mutual exchange of differing views.

For these reasons, I find it natural to describe cultural policy as a policy for freedom of expression.

In my opinion, a cultural policy will have to work along the following three lines.

First, there must be measures which guarantee quality and diversity in cultural affairs. Here we have traditional features such as financial support of the traditional theatre, opera, the visual art and the performance of serious music. But there are also new and ever more pressing needs: guarantees for publications on many topics, an abundance of periodicals, open press debates, and a variety of productions of high quality in the cinemas, on the radio and on TV.

Second, systematic exertion is necessary to ensure that high standards reach all parts of the country and all groups of the population. The passwords here are "decentralisation" and "extension of activity". This activity must interest new audiences; we must also learn to give priorities to groups formerly debarred from cultural life.

Third, cultural policy must allow people to take a personal part in artistic creation. We must encourage amateurs by studying different artistic modes of expression, and widening opportunities to use these modes to express thoughts and feelings. And still on terms laid down by the amateurs. The professionally active artist need not have his field of work circumscribed because a municipality illustrates its local policy with a photographic exhibit or because interested scribes contribute to the preservation of local culture by writing their biographies. On the contrary, as the Secretary General, Mr Kahn-Ackermann, said in his speech, interest in, and respect for, the professional work will grow when talented persons are permitted to test their abilitiy in earnest.

Within each of these three fields, the importance of freedom of speech is obvious. Without a diversified literature, a free dramatic art and an independent, all round press, we shall never establish the open and critical debate required for true democracy.

Without activities which stimulate expression and creation in men, we shall never be effective in widening freedom of speech.

The success of cultural policy very much depends on the possible relationship with local circumstances and on the possibility of contact with the intended audience. It has therefore been quite natural for us in the Nordic countries to transfer cultural policy functions to our broadly based organisations representing the strong popular movements.

To a great extent, modern Nordic society is an offspring of large popular movements. The free church, the temperance, the labour organisations, the trade unions and the co-operative movements all emerged around the turn of the century in protest against an unjust society based on privilege. These organisations evolved into powerful generators of social change and have been entrusted with important duties in most sectors.

Many popular movements have sponsored their own cultural programmes from the very beginning. They have built their own houses, created their own institutions and themselves financed most of their operations. It has been utterly axiomatic for us, after having gradually built up our resources, to pursue a conscious cultural policy, to latch-on to the popular movement traditions and transfer duties to the organisations.

Thanks to the strength that the popular movements have in our countries, and the trust they enjoy, it has been possible to give them the individual freedom to control activities financed by public money. As a result, we can adjust rapidly and flexibly to current needs and can accommodate wider influence on operational planning. The favourable results of the interaction between organs of government and the free life of organised groups are perhaps the most important contribution the Nordic countries can offer to a European discussion of cultural policy in our changing society.

Address by Mr Ludwig von Moos, former Federal Councillor, Switzerland

I

In the last few years education and culture have assumed a very important place in the political life of Europe. There is a variety of reasons for this. Speakers here have quite rightly drawn attention to the close links between social and political progress on the one hand and cultural development on the other. We have no difficulty accepting many of the ideas put forward on this subject, especially since a purely aesthetic concept of culture has always been rejected in my country. According to Max Frisch, one of our best known writers, culture as far as we are concerned consists primarily in the sum of a people's civic behaviour and resides more in a community attitude than in the artistic or scientific masterpiece of any ony citizen. I feel it important, however, to point out that, whilst depending on social and political conditions, culture also constitutes an independent sector essentially related to the mind and to ethics and which can in its various manifestations only partially be related to economic and social conditions. In particular the quality of cultural creation, which must be the main object of public or private sponsorship, is not simply a function of these conditions. One cannot consider culture only in the light of its dependence on the standard of living or technical progress or mainly in the light of its impact on the social importance or position of the population groups to which it is addressed. Cultural achievements have an intrinsic value.

If we assert the primacy of the spiritual as over the material, it is because we are convinced it also provides a justification for its claim to independence vis-à-vis the state. For this reason cultural activities cannot be planned in the same way as other sectors of public activity and measures to encourage culture often have no immediate political purpose. For the historian Jacob Burckhardt, the state and culture were opposing forces. It follows that in certain circumstances conflict can arise in the relations between culture and the state.

II

Starting from these general comments, I would like to give a brief account of some principles of Swiss cultural policy. I am referring to the principles of subsidiarity or complementarity and federalism, which enable every citizen to take a direct part in cultural policy-making, and this is in our eyes an essential condition for the development of a democratic culture, which means individual participation and a diversity of opinions and modes of artistic expression. In a word we are concerned with freedom of artistic creation.

In our federal system, whose origins are linked to the right to resist as it was known in Christendom in the Middle Ages, there is still a certain opposition to rules imposed from above and also to the will to power on the part of the state. Thus the authorities responsible for cultural policy have long been of the opinion that the task of the state as regards cultural policy consists not so much in undertaking activities itself as in helping and encouraging the action of free and spontaneous forces. For this reason cultural life is to a large extent privately run. The result is that any citizen who is interested has many possibilities of taking a direct and active part in cultural life and that the action of the state is deliberately restricted.

The participation of the individual in cultural life and in the decisions on cultural policy is furthermore decisively encouraged by the fact – and here I touch upon the second principle – that cultural policy is less a matter for the central state than for the member states, i.e. the cantons, and within these, the local authorities. Indeed, it is in the framework of these public authorities, which are generally small enough for the citizen to obtain an overall view of the situation, that our referendum democracy frequently requires him to adopt a position on questions of cultural policy. I might mention an example which is known outside our country, namely the vote by which a few years ago the citizens of Basle took a decision on a special appropriation of several million francs to acquire two Picassos for the art gallery.

The vote was preceded by a long public debate, in which representatives of all sections of the population took part. This public discussion of all the arguments for and against this expenditure, which was finally decided on by a large majority, made a broad section of the public aware of the meaning and nature of modern art. This in turn gave the public a greater awareness of the value of its art gallery.

In a country with 4 language groups belonging to different cultural spheres, uncompromising federalism is a political necessity, above all

in the cultural field. It also encourages the creation of a great number of cultural strong-points, which means not only that account can be taken of the diversity of cultural needs and aspirations, but also that the preservation of a spread of opinions and forms of artistic expression is ensured. Conferring the widest possible powers on the smaller authorities is in our view one of the means of fighting against the uniformity of needs and ways of life, brought about by the development of an industrial society which may spell the end of all that distinguishes a particular individual or group. We are aware of the dangers of this system, in particular of the risk of uneven cultural development in the various regions. It is one of the objects of the Federal authorities' cultural policy to take whatever measures are required to prevent this. These drawbacks are up to a certain point the price we have to pay for spiritual and cultural diversity, whose conservation and encouragement constitute the first aim of our cultural policy.

I agree that the important thing about freedom of artistic creativity, a principle recognised by all democratic states, which practically no one objects to in theory, is how to put it into practice especially when it comes to taking measures to encourage the creators of works of culture. In our view what matters when a state provides economic support is not only the extent of its financial assistance, but also the way – by whom and how – it is provided. In order to make sure that political authorities do not take advantage of such measures of encouragement to bring influence to bear on intellectual and cultural activities, our central government and many cantonal governments entrust the task of taking such measures to organisations independent of the state, such as foundations.

However, if it is true to say that there can be no cultural policy without money, it is just as true to say that in this field in particular material assistance alone is not enough. The present economic situation provides enough evidence for all of us of the limits of material growth; for some this is a problem. But it can also have a beneficial effect if we seize the opportunity to take more interest in the non-material values of life, such as the family, our historical background, community problems and spiritual matters. I am convinced that our society can only be renewed through reflecting on a scale of values which attributes primacy to the spiritual. This is our supreme objective which must apply equally to cultural policy.

Address by Mgr Zabkar, Apostolic delegate to Holy See

The Holy See has always been interested in culture, like indeed all Christians belonging to the various faiths. This interest is still alive today, at a time when man feels that a consumer and welfare society, conceived in somewhat materialistic terms, sometimes poses an insidious threat to his spirit of contemplation, of personal initiative, of creative liberty, of anxious search for the many facets of truth and beauty, that is, to his relationship with art and culture. In this connection, the delegation of the Holy See is pleased to confirm before this important assembly the very aspirations expressed by the Second Vatican Council:

"It is now possible to free most of humanity from the misery of ignorance. Therefore, the duty most consonant with our times, especially for Christians, is that of working diligently for fundamental decisions to be taken in economic and political affairs, both on the national and international level, which will everywhere recognize and satisfy the right of all to a human and social culture in conformity with the dignity of the human person without any discrimination of race, sex, nation, religion, or social conditions."

All should therefore be provided – says the Council – with sufficient cultural assets, especially those which constitute "basic culture", in order that a very great number of people shall not be prevented by illiteracy and lack of initiative from contributing in truly human fashion to the common good.

From the point of view of helping towards the cultural development of the individual and of society, the delegation of the Holy See sincerely hopes that this Conference may be a step on the way towards greater cultural fulfilment, on the scale of the individual, the natural centre of any really human policy; on the scale of the family, the window through which man casts his first glance over the complex and inspiring panorama of the world; on the scale of spontaneous

cultural and artistic associations, which, being the fruit of liberty and consequent elective affinities, deserve the respect of all those who have at heart legitimate and creative sponsorship in the field of culture and art; and finally on the municipal, regional, national and European scale. No culturally united Europe, we will certainly agree, must ever ignore the multiple roots, including the Christian roots, of the various human and social strata which have contributed to its creation. Here as in other fields the recognition and application of the principle of solidarity seems to be particularly desirable. As regards the Holy See, I would like to recall its determination to continue to encourage everything which is truly cultural and artistic. Whatever is worthy of being called culture and art can never be dissociated from goodness and beauty; for, in the opinion of the Holy See, ethics and aesthetics must always be related and never be separated if they are to be real human values.

As in the past, the Catholic Church will therefore continue to open its doors to artists and craftsmen, as the border line between their respective professions and trades remains indefinable. In the past there was the period of the obscure yet sublime builders of Norman and Gothic cathedrals, the period of the great masters of the Renaissance and the Baroque. In the present the Church invites all creators of beauty, such as architects, sculptors, painters, cabinet-makers, engravers and composers to design new places for prayer, to create liturgical objects worthy of their purpose and intelligible to believers and if possible also to non-believers, to discover new harmonies and melodies which will stand comparison with the sublime quality of Gregorian chant. In the present as in the past, the purpose is the same: to remind man that he is also spirit and that his spirit is something eternal, a spark of eternal beauty. This is precisely what was meant by the final message of the Council: The Church has long been your ally. You have built and decorated its temples, celebrated its dogmas, enriched its liturgy; you have helped it convey its divine message in the language of form and figure, to make the invisible world apprehensible. In the present as in the past, the Church needs you, turns to you. The world in which we live needs beauty to avoid sinking into despair. The whole world, all men need beauty. Beauty, like truth, is what brings joy to the heart of man; it is a precious fruit that withstands the passage of time, that outlives generations and brings them to commune in admiration, through the work of your hands. May these hands be pure and disinterested. Remember that you are the guardians of beauty in the world.

Address by Mr Kalevi Kivistö Minister of Education, Responsible for Cultural Affairs, Finland

It is a well-known fact that not all social institutions develop at an equal pace: development in some sectors is particularly rapid, whereas other sectors lag behind. I believe that the phenomenon called cultural life quite accurately reflects this fact in most countries. The cultural policies of governments and their administration have not been able to keep pace with the rapid changes that have shaped cultural activities.

The last two decades have brought about a severe and even unprecedented crisis in culture and cultural behaviour. The transition has been caused primarily by the rapid development and popularisation of mass media as well as the explosive growth of industrially-produced mass culture. Behind these changes are the introduction of more effective production and marketing methods in the culture industry. As a result of these developments, the problem of industrialised countries is not – to express it in strong terms – the quantity of the cultural supply, but its forms, content and quality. The quality of industrially-produced mass culture has deteriorated in part, and intentional violence, for instance has increased. I find this particularly alarming as regards the cultural goods directed at children.

It is obvious that, in their cultural policies, governments have not given adequate attention to the new circumstances created by the rapid growth of industrially-produced culture. Public cultural policy and cultural administration are largely concerned with issues related to traditional art forms and institutions – which are important as such – but they seem little worried about new problems caused by industrially-produced mass culture.

I represent a small country at this conference. Finland has about four and a half million inhabitants, the country is sparsely populated

and the people speak a language which is not related to any of the languages represented at our meeting. As I see it, the problems of industrially-produced mass culture are particularly acute in small countries and small language areas. Let me illustrate my point of view with a few examples:

Nearly all films presented in Finland are of foreign origin, for our domestic film production has diminished to a few feature films a year. This is a result of the pressures which foreign imports and competition with television have created. It may be difficult for representatives of bigger countries even to imagine that the Finnish audience must watch films spoken in a language which they do not understand and consequently resort to subtitles at the bottom of the screen. This even applies to imported television programmes which fill a considerable portion of the transmitting time. Close to 100 per cent of comic books sold in Finland also come from abroad. The corresponding figure for records is some 60 per cent.

This spate of industrial mass culture is primarily a challenge, implying new tasks for cultural policies carried out by governments in their own countries. It is of great importance that we strive to safeguard the position of domestic production in the most vulnerable areas of the culture industry. In my view, this can, and in some cases must, be done through public measures. In Finland, domestic film production and the supply of cultural goods intended for children have been considered as areas which are regarded as most vulnerable.

Efforts to eliminate prevailing inequalities in cultural life demand that cultural policy be closely linked with social progress and its democratisation. By removing the obstacles caused by educational, economic, social and regional inequalities, we also create the real preconditions for developing cultural democracy. On the other hand, the democratisation of cultural life affects the overall democratisation of society in a positive direction. An intellectually active and creative individual is able to view himself and the society around him in a much more conscious and critical way. He is more willing to act as an agent of change for a more human, and intellectually richer, life.

The problem of industrially-produced mass culture cannot be solved by governmental measures alone. By their price policy and by taking advantage of their monopoly position, supranational enterprises can deprive domestic production of its chances, force domestic cultural products out of the market, and destroy the basis of cultural policy. International trade offers examples of agreements which aim at protecting national production and preserving the level of domestic

input in certain vulnerable areas of production. Is it not time to accept culture as the kind of area of production worth protecting?

Mass culture is typically supranational. The contents of mass communication have either been produced by supranational enterprises or they represent foreign origin, at least in ideals and ideas. Supranational culture has frequently a suffocating effect on national and ethnic cultures. It is therefore quite natural that the spread of mass culture has resulted in a lively debate and attitudes of opposition. However, opposing attitudes alone are not enough to solve problems in either cultural policy or other areas of social policy. They cannot be solved simply by condemning, or preventing, international cultural imports.

I would like to conclude by emphasising that isolation offers no sensible solution to the problems of international interaction in today's world. Even if we are opposed to supranational mass culture, international cultural and informational exchange should not be hampered as a result.

Address by Lord Donaldson, Minister for the Arts UK

One of the particular advantages in coming to a Conference of colleagues in other countries is the discipline imposed by having to explain one's own domestic policies in a context, and with a vocabulary, which can be understood by others. The Conference concerns Ministers of "Culture": it may therefore disconcert those who do not know our ways that we in the United Kingdom have no cultural policies. We have policies for what we call "the arts"; we have policies for leisure, for sport, for education throughout life, for the social services; and we are increasingly framing policies for what we call the environment. But we have no policies for "culture" as such. We regard it as part of government as a whole.

Let me identify two complementary strands in our policies for the arts. The first is for the identification of excellence and its encouragement and preservation against the ravages of time, costs, and forgery. I think we can claim a good record here with our national collections, our national companies, our national orchestras, and the programme of support for which the Arts Council of Great Britain was established in 1946. Some have argued that we have concentrated too much on London – but in what country has that kind of argument never been made? One cannot spread excellence unless one has developed or preserved it somewhere: and it is an important part of our policy to spread the best in the arts as widely as possible throughout the country.

But this is only one of two basic tasks. At the opposite end of the spectrum we must spread the arts in quite a different sense: but one which is of equal importance if national policies for the arts to be both comprehensive and successful. This opposite task is to ensure that everyone has the fullest opportunity to involve himself in artistic activity and thus to come to realise – more emphatically than in any other way – the value and the enjoyment of participation in the arts.

We need different standards by which to judge this: excellence here means something quite different from the canons of attainment which, for example, the Arts Council applies in giving its support to established performers. Excellence in this aspect is to be judged by the involvement of the performer and the extent to which he thereby becomes identified with the arts. This is of course a more controversial subject but I suspect that it is the one on which this Conference will be chiefly about and which could give its findings considerable importance. The value of amateur and voluntary performances derives from the effort and enjoyment of the individual and from the understanding it confers on the problems which the great artists have faced and overcome. Moreover, it is greater than this: out of such developments new art forms are apt to spring and the most secure foundation for an arts policy is the fullest possible involvement of the people as a whole.

The problem must be tackled in a number of different ways: in education, in social services, in the presentation and accessibility of established art forms, and in the provision of new programmes and new ways of public participation. We must use to the full the possibilities of television. We must see that the resources of art galleries and museums are properly presented to the world at large and not simply to a restricted circle of cognoscienti. We must exploit to the maximum the resources of exhibitions, touring and the like. All this is established doctrine, however difficult or expensive its achievement may prove in practice. The really debatable ground is how far and by what means a policy for the arts can be a policy for the majority.

Enthusiastic educationalists have shown that given the particular methods and enough drive and vision a very large proportion of the total population can become practitioners – for example the efforts of Suzuki and his school in teaching the violin. This is one end of the problem of how to involve maximum numbers in traditional art forms. At the other end there is the problem of involving art forms in the ways of the people. Our experience with community arts is still too short to be dogmatic either about methods of support or ways by which their content may be judged. But this at least can be said: that we need to experiment further and on a much larger scale. All cultural policies financed by governments are vulnerable if they do not benefit those who finance them – namely the taxpayers as a whole. The public will not pay for grand metropolitan art unless from their own experience they can attest the value of art in some form or other. But the cultural element is easily lost: it is most damaged by those who

simply use art forms as devices for putting across other things. If this were allowed to happen we should lose all possibility of judging the value of what is done: our cultural policies would be intellectually bankrupt at worst or at best simply the vehicles for other policies.

To meet this problem in the United Kingdom we believe that as an essential link in the chain for public support of the arts we need specialised bodies who are able to devise criteria by which to judge the artistic merit of what is supported. This is the corner-stone of our practice in the United Kingdom: it is the basis for the Arts Council, the British Film Institute, the Trustee system for our museums and galleries: a system of specialised advice in each field which alone can ensure the integrity of each art form and prevent us using the arts simply as devices for other purposes. In the United Kingdom we cannot claim to have learned all the answers: at least we commend this part of our system to the world and I hope that our discussions in this meeting so generously organised by the Norwegian Government will bring us further towards the complete solution of these difficult problems.

Address by Dr. K. Moersch
Minister of State, Federal Republic of Germany

I welcome the opportunity to elucidate some of the distinctive features of the cultural policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. The Europe which is the goal of our efforts has to be a federal Europe which fully preserves the variety and richness of all our different ways of life. The task of shaping a federal Europe is the challenge facing our society.

The Federal Republic of Germany is a federal country, as is evident from its name. This federal structure, which has developed historically and is enshrined in the constitution, also determines the cultural policy of the Federal Republic of Germany and takes account, too, of the modern principle of decentralisation. However, this federal structure does sometimes make it difficult for the Federal Republic to speak with one voice outside the country, with a voice that corresponds to its internal division of powers. Nevertheless, the principle of federalism as realised in the Federal Republic is a sound institution which is not regretted and it could, indeed, also be of interest to the nascent Europe.

Despite all the differences in detail, the negotiations in Basket III at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe demonstrated that in the European context, too, there exist a common foundation of cultural values. As Mr Zachrisson pointed out in his opening speech, these values, however, as a result of developments in science and technology, have undergone a change. Terms such as "technology", "technicalisation", "technical progress" have for a long time, almost without qualification, been equated with "the ideal way of life". Culture to a certain extent has become a commodity produced by specialists. It is expressed in measurable quantities: price, fee, royalty, size of edition; these have all become generally accepted proofs of quality. For a long time, people have been addicted to superlatives in the world of culture: they demand only the best, the most, the greatest, also the strangest and the costliest.

Disillusionment was inevitable. In the sixties, we realised that the theory of the necessity of increasingly sophisticated technology and civilisation could also lead to a dead end.

It is not easy, in this day and age, to find a way out of this world of machines, stone and concrete. A first step, however, is to improve the quality of our environment, but equally urgent is to tackle the problem of spiritual impoverishment and isolation. The need here is to restore to the individual his right to individuality – by stimulating his imagination and encouraging his creativity.

The politician's task is to create satisfactory conditions for the realisation of this right. As far as possible these should be established within a European framework, for the stronger the conviction of each individual that he is participating in European cultural life, the stronger, the more impregnable, will Europe become.

The Federal Republic of Germany is ready to render its contribution to the attainment of his goal and thus fulfil the responsibility incumbent upon it in this sphere. Six years ago, it initiated a reform of its foreign cultural policy designed, in the light of the present and future needs of a society in transition, to determine the extent of and to find a new definition for international cultural relations. In the interest of promoting mutual understanding, the Federal Republic has shifted the emphasis away from the one-sided presentation of national programmes to exchange and dialogue. In place of the marked emphasis on the cultural achievements of the past, it now gives priority to the present, including its problems and controversies, as reflected in the whole range of cultural life. Cultural communication cannot be a one-way street. It must aim at all sections of the population. In the view of the Federal Republic of Germany, the role of the politicians is not to act as patrons, dispensing culture to the greatest number possible, but to continually encourage people to personally participate in cultural life. Only this approach will enable us to meet the challenge faced by cultural policy at this time.

Address by Mr Carlos Robles, Minister of Education and Culture, Spain

Spain has been a member of the Council for Cultural Co-operation for nearly 10 years and intends to continue taking an active part in its deliberations. I hope, too, it will eventually become a member of the Council once the basic political reforms, which the Government of His Majesty Juan Carlos I is striving to introduce, have been implemented.

Political reforms are directly linked to culture since the latter is chiefly concerned with the complex world of ideas. We cannot forget the opening phrases of the constitution of UNESCO, where it is said that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed. None of us doubts that the minds of men are the natural field of activity of cultural policy. Only such a policy can indeed fulfil the spiritual needs of men in modern society.

I would also like to congratulate Mr Zachrisson, Swedish Minister for Cultural Affairs, for his excellent introduction to the first theme of our conference. On the whole I agree with his point of view. However, I would like to suggest a few variations on the same theme, which are probably the result of the difference between northern and southern countries.

Spain is a southern European country of Latin culture, to which have been added – in the words of a Spanish writer of the last century – "the embellishments and ornaments of many different countries", and many of these contributions have come from the wealth of Arab culture. As a result the word **passion** has been used to describe the main characteristic of the Spanish by Salvador de Madariaga, the well known Spanish writer, who has now returned to his country and is a fine example of a European intellectual since he writes fluently Spanish, English and French. The same writer who reminds us that **reason** is the main trait of French culture and **action** that of Anglo-

Saxon culture. There is no doubt therefore, that there are substantial differences between European countries.

In my view there is a profound unity between the notions of culture and education. Together they constitute an indissoluble couple and in fact form a single whole. Without going into the complex field of definitions of culture, it seems obvious to me that as far as the majority of the population is concerned, it must be admitted that culture is something which they acquire through education. Furthermore, the transmission of knowledge, on which the educational process essentially depends, is the guarantee of a factor to which I would like to refer to in particular, namely tradition. Culture must of course renew itself in a deeply critical spirit and creators of culture are often non-conformist innovators. But even in this opposition to conformity they must start from earlier foundations. Another Spanish thinker, who is at the same time a great European, Eugenio D'ors, a radical reformer of our aesthetics, said that in art whatever did not belong to tradition was plagiarism, that is, a mere copy. I believe that tradition is in culture at least as important as a capacity for renewal.

It may be for this reason that the management of culture in Spain is mainly in the hands of two Ministries: the Ministry of Education and Science, which is principally responsible for what we might call classical or traditional culture, and the Ministry of Information and Tourism, which looks after popular and new culture, in close liaison with the mass media and the theatrical world. Needless to say, there are many other ministerial departments and a great number of autonomous bodies and local authorities which also help to further the cause of culture. Although some people believe that it would be desirable to create a single Ministry of Culture, others feel that the present division is preferable, since cultural development must be an objective for the country as a whole and therefore for the whole of the government. I have already mentioned the close links between education and culture and it is obvious that there is also a close relationship between culture and the mass media. No-one would dispute the fact that, if the Ministry of Housing has some houses built, it should make sure that libraries are provided, and that when the Ministry of Labour sets up centres of vocational training, it is furthering the cause of culture, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs cannot ignore cultural themes, the more so since Spanish is considered to rank as the second language in the world.

There are many other themes linked to the statement to which I have referred. For instance, that of the relationship between culture and the economy. There is no doubt that European economic

development in the last decades has extended the civilisation of well-being; but on the one hand, there are still in Europe many pockets of poverty, and on the other hand, literary and artistic creativity are not always based on wealth: Greece was not wealthy when it gave birth to Phidias, and Cervantes was poor when he wrote Don Quixote. The advantage of wealth is that it enables society and the state to offer access to culture to a great number of people, and that is very important.

There is also the matter of the commercialisation of culture. This is undoubtedly a manifestation of modern society, a society composed of large masses of people and dominated by machines. This industrial culture is perhaps an alarming phenomenon, since it leads to a generalisation of bad taste, so perfectly expressed in the German word "kitsch", which the other European languages have gradually adopted. I believe, nevertheless, that this is a positive factor, which a real cultural policy should be able to channel for the benefit of each of our peoples. I do not believe that industrialised culture is necessarily adulterated and corrupt.

One of the problems raised by the unity of Europe, which is so desirable, is that of diversity, not only on a national, but also on a regional basis. In the field of culture it is particularly apparent in a country like Spain, where at least 3 different regional languages are spoken apart from the national tongue. We must accept this variety as a factor of enrichment of our cultural life. Spain is making ever greater efforts in this direction, and I might mention as a very recent example, the inauguration ten days ago in Barcelona of the IVth Catalan Book Exhibition organised by the Spanish National Book Institute, which regularly publishes a catalogue in Catalan of course, the last edition of which contains 6,254 different titles from many different publishers. I feel this variety is a stimulus to Spanish unity, just as the cultural differences between my country and Norway should help to save our European community from monotony.

One of the most appreciable differences is that in personal character. For this reason I have no fear at all that modernisation in Spain will bring about problems of communication between people. We Spaniards will probably always be very communicative and outwardlooking in character.

In his commentary, the Swedish Minister for Cultural Affairs raised some very judicious questions which call for an answer. I shall reply briefly to the first by saying that we must extend the application of the principle of equal opportunities as far as possible so as to

reduce hostility and diminish differences between social classes through first class education; I shall reply to the second by saying that we must apply the idea of helping those who help themselves by assisting spontaneous cultural activities and providing them with the necessary material support; I shall reply to the third by recommending a real "brain-washing operation" to convince political leaders that culture is just as important as other sectors of social life; as far as the dangers of commercialisation are concerned, I have already said that a cultural policy could help avoid these, providing there exists a state and local authorities which, though they may remain neutral in the internal struggles inherent in any cultural life, nevertheless in no way abstain from pursuing a cultural policy, or remain indifferent towards culture. A good example, in my view, is that of a state which makes intelligent use of the means at its disposal to avoid an invasion of pornography, which constitutes the most blatant manifestation of this commercialisation, by abusively claiming to represent culture and liberty; finally, in my country at least, the need for a thorough fiscal reform running parallel with our political reform is undeniable if we really wish to obtain enough resources to finance a cultural policy designed for instance, to encourage private patronage of the arts, as is the case in other countries.

To these five questions, I would like to add another based on a simple conviction, namely that modern society makes possible a fabulous and almost unlimited increase in the consumption of cultural products. I would like briefly to recount an anecdote. A few years ago, the Spanish Ministry of Information and Tourism held a competition among private publishers to launch a popular series of books with the backing of liberal free publicity on the national radio and television networks; it was estimated that some 100,000 copies of each volume might be sold. However, the first of the titles published – a novel by Miguel de Unamuno – sold 760,000 copies. In these circumstances, what worries me is not the impact of modern life on culture seen as a mass of consumers, but the impact it might have on the isolated individual, on the individual creator, on the man who, in the last resort, will always be the real generator of great works, the real driving force in culture. The efforts of a conscious cultural policy must in these times above all be directed to assisting and protecting this spark, this personal talent which is still the source of culture.

Address by Mr N. Matthiasen, Minister for Cultural Affairs, Denmark

I think it comes as no surprise that I whole-heartedly support my colleague, Mr Zachrisson of Sweden, in his introductory speech. However, I should like to add a few remarks on behalf of the Danish Delegation. The final objectives of an active cultural policy can be formulated in numerous ways. It could be said to be a case of changing society, of creating a better environment and a greater social equality. Or, the main stress could be laid on cultural policy as an instrument for ensuring the individual's personal development, and his possibilities for self-expression. This is a necessary condition to ensure the feeling that life is meaningful, that one may actively contribute to social development. It may, in fact, be merely two ways of saying the same thing.

I would like to stress one particular aspect, namely the vital importance I attach to an active cultural policy as an instrument to assure, consolidate and develop the democratic form of government and way of life in our countries.

Democracy cannot be taken for granted. The democratic form of government from a global point of view has met with extremely limited success. It exists only in a small part of the world, and now, as in the past, democracy is threatened by external as well as internal forces.

The industrial countries of our part of the world have seen a development which has brought great benefits to the population: more affluence for most, greater social and economic security and more leisure time. But this development also has negative features.

The population is increasingly concentrated in the big cities. Many people live in sterile housing environments, forced into isolation whether as individuals or as families. Work is divided into smaller and smaller units and is felt by many to be increasingly monotonous, deadening and unfulfilling. Administration is complicated and en-

compasses such vast areas that the man in the street feels lost and powerless against the remote decision-making forces affecting his life. The environment is threatened not only by pollution, and the growing commercialisation of the cultural sphere tends to render people merely passive consumers of mass-produced culture.

All these factors seriously threaten democracy. The representative, democratic form of government – that of our societies – will hardly survive unless it is rooted in more direct forms of democracy, involving as many as possible in the social and economic processes.

To establish such a direct democratic commitment it is vital, in my opinion, that an active cultural policy should undermine some of the negative trends mentioned a moment ago, particularly isolation and the feeling of powerlessness against the political decisions. It is necessary, through such a policy, to attempt to offer everybody the opportunity of developing abilities, imagination and awareness. This opportunity is a condition of enabling the individual – in co-operation with others – to take an active part in shaping society and his own life. The greater the success of such a policy, the greater are the possibilities of a trend towards increased social equality in society. Without an active effort of this nature, far too many will fall easy victims to commercialism and the political forces which, wihtout an understanding of community and solidarity, appeal only to the most shortsighted, and narrow, egoism.

A cultural policy with this aim must be a decentralised policy. It must encourage and support local schemes, whether these are initiated by local authorities, national organisations and societies, or by independent groups. And it must inspire personal activity.

During recent years in Denmark there has been a considerable growth of local initiatives. This applies equally to activities of traditional, cultural, artistic nature (theatre, music, etc.) both by professionals and amateurs, and to new experimental forms. Some examples of he latter are described in the report prepared by Finn Jor, on the "Demystification of Culture", included in the documents of the Conference.

The new cultural policies taking shape in many of the countries represented at this Conference, still include, as a primary consideration, the creation of the best possible conditions for art and for artists. The extended concept of culture which it is necessary to implement does not mean that this part of the task can be neglected or assigned a low priority. A free art is necessary to democracy, which cannot live without the imagination, and the constant criticism of the established values expressed by artists.

However, we must at the same time make strong efforts in other areas – in all those areas where cultural policy encourages people to become active citizens, active in the sphere of art, as is done through the amateur movements, and active in other social areas, as is done through many of the new forms of cultural activity.

I would like, as others have already done today, to stress in this context the need to make a special effort with regard to children – a group which is currently under-supplied with culture and particularly vulnerable to the effect of the purely commercial cultural industry. Denmark, together with the other Nordic countries, is now making an effort to find out what could be done to meet the cultural needs of children.

The new forms of activity – I am thinking, among other things, of various types of cultural or creative centres, "Houses", "Citizens' Houses", or whatever we choose to call them – are of great importance because they establish contact with population groups otherwise beyond the reach of cultural policy.

Centres and houses of the new type, particularly those appealing primarily to young people in towns, are, it must be admitted, often controversial as a result of their frequent experimentation with new forms of management far removed from those we know in more traditional institutions. They require a measure of tolerance on the part of the authorities and other citizens; this tolerance is sometimes lacking, but it must be developed. If not, cultural policy risks being of no concern to large sections of the population – particularly youth. And, at the same time, we are precluded from benefitting from an experimental and renewing activity which is taken for granted within the field of research, but which is still difficult to recognise and understand when it comes to art and culture.

The more recent media, like film, TV and video, create special challenges to cultural policy. They are costly, and therefore often monopolised by governments or large commercial concerns. It is important that access be widened to permit the man in the street to express himself through these media.

Local radio and TV services, and various forms of film, tape and TV workshops, will be able to break the existing monopolies and offer added possibilities for discussion and active interest in social problems. Such an interest is a condition of democracy retainig its attraction and vitality.

Address by Mr M. Guy, Minister for Cultural Affairs, France

I was very struck by what our Finnish colleague said in particular. There is no doubt that the **mass media** and **cultural industries** do more to shape the cultural life of our fellow citizens, and especially our children, than all the institutions for which we are responsible. This is one aspect of the crisis with which we have to deal. The mass media in fact make a substantial contribution to that cultural uniformity against which we must take action.

I was also struck by what our Swedish colleague said about the greater part of the population not having any access to culture. After two centuries of industrial development and notwithstanding a century of free and compulsory public education, this is a further aspect of the crisis of our societies. I would add that uncontrolled industrial development and rigidity of educational policies also make for cultural uniformity.

My Danish colleague has just mentioned **youth**. The young people I meet in the streets of Oslo, who are just the same as those in the streets of Paris, are all too often reminded of values to which they no longer subscribe. This is a third aspect of this social crisis which I believe it is our duty to put right.

Crisis of society, crisis of civilisation; such is the situation which makes it essential to define genuine cultural policies and which points towards the real significance of our meeting. But the cultural policy which my government is trying to put into practice is by no means mononlithic. Rather it is designed to adjust to differing problems and situations which include the protection of the heritage, the dissemination of works of high quality and of all kinds of tendencies, the community development in towns and the countryside, and art teaching.

We are all clearly agreed that a cultural policy must in no way be restrictive. It must not establish an intellectual and artistic orthodoxy. In other words, it must be pluralistic. Starting from these requirements, then, what are the principles on which France must base her cultural policy? They may be summarised in a few propositions, starting with that of my predecessor, André Malraux, namely access to culture for the greatest number. Broadening access to culture means in the first place improving the distribution of cultural products. For this purpose, I recently set up a national agency for the dissemination of art, which subsidises touring companies and exhibitions in France, so that performances and shows of a high standard can be staged in towns and even small towns. Beyond this obligation it is important to consider how culture can be deeply integrated in the life of every individual, by stimulating varied creativity on the part of individuals and small groups of people, in my opinion, this objective can only be achieved by contractual methods, that is, through contracts with local authorities and contracts with professionals. I have, therefore, launched a policy of cultural charters between the state and local authorities, towns, departments or regions. A charter is a contract, in which the state and the local authority undertake, generally for a period of three years, to conduct a concerted and generalised policy of cultural development. Under these contracts, both parties undertake to define explicit medium-term objectives and to take into account all aspects of cultural policy. A charter also requires elected representatives — and this in my opinion is one of its merits — to take account of the cultural problems of the population and of its cultural preferences, and to try to satisfy the latter with our help.

Safeguarding and enhancing monuments, sites and town centres are also tasks of the highest importance. But here the mere protection of historical monuments appears to me insufficient. I believe it is essential that we should now take more interest in preserving the character of towns. But this is still not the crux of the matter. Community development projects in streets and districts, support for group activities and the co-operation of elected representatives and officials all seem to me to guarantee both the virtues of decentralisation, a specifically French problem, and the standard of quality which the state alone can maintain in certain fields.

This culture for the greatest number must also be a living culture. Museums must open their doors to the public; they must be places for real meetings, not only with works of art, but also with other people. Contemporary creation must no longer develop in closed circles, but must be broadly accessible to all classes and ages. Here I have high

hopes of the future Centre Pompidou. A museum, library, industrial creation centre and at the same time institute of musical research, this centre will be operating in the centre of Paris at the beginning of next year with a capacity of 10,000 visitors a day. It should be a place of avant-garde cultural research and at the same a public meeting place, a two-fold opportunity for all to admire and to create. Lastly, it should be pointed out that the Centre Pompidou will not reinstate cultural centralisation; its activities will spread throughout France and, I hope, Europe.

All in all, it therefore seems essential to combat both passive cultural consumption and too narrow a concept of "cultured" culture. The policies to be implemented in the light of these twin objectives are quite clear. Firstly, those who not otherwise would have been able or willing to become involved must be encouraged to participate. This is the role of community development. Individuals must also be allowed to be responsible for their own environment, and to build it themselves instead of having it imposed on them. Above all we must encourage and develop the creativity of every individual, and of all who are willing to research, invent and create. The all-important role of the amateur must be recognised and furthered and there must be encouragement for associations combining as they do the expression of the need to create and the means of satisfying it must be encouraged.

We are here of course very far removed from the type of mass culture which tends towards uniformity. But I am talking to you about a culture for each, which alone fosters differing cultural emanations. I am convinced that this is the way we must follow if we are to meet the challenge.

Address by Mr David Mourão Ferreira (Portugal)

I believe we are the only European country here which has lived through two revolutions in the last two years. The first of these revolutions, that of 25 April 1974, was the more striking and radical of the two, but the second, that which occurred on 25 November 1975, was no less significant for the present and for the future of our country. And both, of course, had a decisive effect on our attitude towards culture, towards the production and dissemination of works of art or literature, in other words towards cultural policy as a whole.

It is now common knowledge that our April revolution – the flower revolution – was soon on the point of betraying itself and nearly brought us to the brink of a new totalitarian abyss, which threatened to cut us off from our European roots and from our own democratic traditions, which half a century of dictatorship had failed to stifle. For a few months, there was a dangerous slide towards the incongruous notion of an all-powerful state which, in spite of the chaotic forms it assumed, was steadily trying in the medium term to impose totally rigid models for both the production and the consumption of works of culture. There was even an attempt to nationalise many of the circuits in the fields of publishing, the theatre, the cinema and music; and they went so far as to exclude from an exhibition of paintings, which was to be held abroad, all works not inspired by so-called "realist aesthetics"; this obviously meant the blacklisting of many avant-garde experiments, some of which were not even particularly recent.

But on 25 November 1975, when the preparations for the totalitarian coup d'état were exposed and there was a return to the purity of intentions of 25 April of the previous year, the horizon finally cleared and it was possible to envisage a truly pluralistic cultural policy, completely free of propaganda directives or attempts at partisan control. And two months later, when I, who do not belong to any political party, was called upon to take up an appointment as Secretary of State for Culture, we were able to present the country with the

main lines of the cultural policy we had worked out and which, briefly summarised, are as follows:

- to ensure the permanent preservation and use of our cultural heritage, by drawing up an inventory and bringing it up to date;
- to stimulate research into the deepest origins of this heritage and the ways of ensuring its survival and continuity;
- to assist the creation, protection and dissemination of works of the mind and products of the imagination, whether individual or collective;
- resolutely to transform into a communal asset what was for too long the privilege of a few minorities;
- to draw up an inventory of all private cultural institutions, and of all the creative and active personnel attached to them, and contribute towards their dynamic performance and the co-ordination of their programmes;
- to contribute, in the present historical context, to a knowledge of the social position of writers, artists and intellectuals, so as to establish the legal basis for their work and for their insertion into Portuguese society;
- to awaken a taste for culture and to stimulate ways of securing real participation in cultural activities, both in individuals and in the public as a whole, including the communities furthest removed from the main centres;
- to organise, provide and consolidate a growing network of centres of research and cultural stimulus, of structures aimed at the dissemination of books and theatrical works, better knowledge of museums and art galleries, and greater interest in musical events and discussions;
- to prevent by all means available these activities from becoming the object of attempts at control on the part of political parties;
- to encourage the defence of the Portuguese language, and better knowledge of our history and of our ways of looking at life, both at home and in the other Portuguese communities dispersed throughout the world;
- to co-operate closely with all Portuguese-speaking peoples and nations, not only for the purpose of safeguarding common cultural links but also in order to learn to know, come into contact with and respect our differences;

– to establish and strengthen reciprocal cultural relations with all countries in the world, so as to make ourselves receptive to the images and expressions of culture from every kind of country and to transmit to them pictures and impressions of our own culture.

This is not the place to go into the details of the practical application of all these objectives. In conclusion, I would like to thank the Council of Europe for the opportunity we have been given to discuss our views, our detailed tactics or general strategies and our joint problems as heirs and protagonists of a common civilisation. And whilst hoping very soon to become full Members of the Council of Europe [1] we would like to express our satisfaction at already belonging to the Council for Cultural Co-operation, since we are well aware that its help and support will be essential if we are to achieve many of these objectives.

1. Portugal became a full Member of the Council of Europe in September 1976.

THEME II

Cultural Policy as an Instrument for Improving the Quality of Life in Town and Country Communities

Address by Mrs R. de Backer Van Ocken, Minister for Dutch Culture and Flemish Affairs (Belgium)

Anyone interested in cultural work is privileged to be living in this age. For some 10 years now as Ernst Bloch noted our civilisation has been at a clear turning-point.

The change began in the Spring of 1968, and I think that by 1978 we shall realise how decisive the past ten years have been historically.

In my opinion we are living through a break with the past similar to those which occurred in the 15th and 16th centuries.

We are moving on to a new stage in the evolution of human conscience. The main characteristic of this turning-point is a profound change in our relationship with nature. In the 15th and 16th centuries, physics replaced metaphysics. In our day we are seeing the end of the Faustian era.

The economic crisis which has ravaged the industrialised countries, and at this moment is still of grave concern to statesmen and politicians, has suddenly brought us face to face with the limits to growth, the need to replace quantity by quality. If we wish to survive, we all need to change our attitudes profoundly.

Our present mission is of planetary dimensions. We have to devise a new blueprint for civilisation. This is the only significance which can reasonably be attributed to cultural policy nowadays.

It is certainly impossible to deal with all the aspects of the mission facing cultural policy today. So I shall merely make a few personal comments and draw attention to a number of points in the light of my modest experience as a Minister of Cultural Affairs in a small country, for a small community.

It seems to me that in this year 1976 cultural policy should above all be concerned with two things: firstly to give more meaning to the lives of as many human beings as possible, and secondly, to create a living environment.

Everyone is entitled to culture. In the last few years this has most fortunately come to be just as much accepted as the right to work. The right to culture was written into the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948: paragraph 27 says that everyone has the right to participate freely in the cultural life of the community and to enjoy the arts.

It may be affirmed on the one side that never in the past have we devoured more of the products of culture; to quote Alvin Toffler, our contemporaries have become veritable culture-consumers. On the other side, the need for culture is more clearly apparent than ever before.

For example, the enormous increase in the spread of books and gramaphone records in the last ten years might lead us to conclude that we are witnessing a "cultural renaissance". However, the British economist, E. J. Mishan, whose intellect I admire, assures us that this would be quite mistaken. According to him, nothing could be further from the truth and it would be quite safe to say that, quite accidentally, culture has become fashionable and the sign of a degree of prosperity which has created an atmosphere dominated by the desire for what is "new" and "different".

I feel, however, that Mishan's opinion needs some qualifying. There has always been snobbery and clever people have always ridiculed it. I feel sure in my own mind that many of our contemporaries find intrinsic satisfaction in culture. I believe that never in the past has there been such a need for culture, even though this need is at times somewhat unfortunately expressed.

The masses, caught up as they are in the industrial process and living at the hectic pace peculiar to our times, are manifesting their will to escape from it to some extent.

It is up to us, who are responsible for cultural policy, not just to offer them leisure pursuits which provide escape but to stimulate creativity and the artistic sense, so as to eliminate the feeling of **Unheimlichkeit** and alienation.

This brings me to put forward an idea which appears to me essential: our cultural policy must in a sense be to appeal to man's

creative forces rather than to distribute cultural products and subsidies through the authorities, as it were to "evangelise" people, which is how it is all too often seen.

This kind of missionary zeal, which still takes control of a good many cultural sponsors, does have something touching about it, but something rather absurd as well.

A Dutch commentator has put it most amusingly. Although, he wrote, the intrinsic goodness of art has so far been proved less convincingly than, for instance, the intrinsic harmfulness of cigarettes, there is still a general belief in the curative, sedative, analgesic, formative and educative powers of art, which is even viewed as a way of improving the world.

As with most religions, the same writer went on, many missionaries have arisen. Their goal is to bring art to humanity. If they fail, they may even try to drag humanity to the feet of the works of art, in the hope of bringing about their "conversion".

To this they devote long and patient effort. Just as the attempt was made in the old days to bring home to black communities by means of very tangible pearl necklaces and double-sided mirrors the abstract Christian notion of passion, in the same way there are some who would like to convert our "cultural pagans" from their popular customs to a doctrine such as structuralism.

Possibly this commentator, too, was going a little too far. But a warning does seem to be necessary against treating culture as a gimmick and against its blind, uncontrolled and meaningless consumption.

In my view, artistic experience, together with permanent education, which I should like to deal with in a moment, constitutes the essential element of any cultural policy. I have the impression that in this respect the present situation is not so very favourable and that there are various obstacles to the right to enjoy the arts, which as we saw is stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Real artistic experience gives a meaning and a substance to human life and is a real way of improving its quality. A work of art is ideally personal achievement, the result of the individual's own volition. It does not directly further productivity; what it offers more than anything is the joy of creativity. It is a remedy for alienation.

Yet, this lofty conception of works of art is being desecrated as never before in history. To many minds art and money go together;

works of art are reaching unprecedented prices; a revoltingly cynical spirit of commercialism is spreading. How many people there are in these inflationary times who see works of art as the safest form of investment! The Muses alas are flirting with Mercury, and the fruit of this deplorable union is the art thief.

This new form of crime against which we are practically helpless, is merely the product of a society unhealthily obsessed with the possible financial value of creativity.

How sad it is that this obstacle should arise just at the time when art could teach men a new attitude towards nature – an attitude of creative sympathy, not destructive conquest. By attaching greater value to the aesthetic we can cultivate imagination. It is imagination which should enable us to make proper use of the resources provided by the inventive mind.

Artistic experience, I repeat gives life substance. Similarly, I believe that permanent education can improve the quality of life.

I should like to take as our starting point an idea expressed by the philosopher Ivan Illich, who says we have to create a new educational relationship between man and his environment. In order to develop this new approach, we must at the same time change our concept of the adult and the teaching resources in our daily lives.

Permanent education is a principle of cultural policy according to which every citizen should have the opportunity, at each moment of his life, to broaden his knowledge and to learn whatever he feels the need of.

This helps to create a situation where men are no longer resigned to a daily routine, where they no longer accept servile submission to reality. It gives them new hope in life, a desire for change, a wish to help in shaping policies which previously they felt were imposed on them.

The goal of permanent education is to increase knowledge; in particular it facilitates better understanding of an increasingly complex reality and the individual's awareness of his own situation. The fulfilment of every individual must be the condition for fulfilment of the whole community. Each citizen must be equipped with ideas and knowledge which enable him to participate in fixing society's objectives.

The normal way to achieve this would be to make free a part of the time devoted to the industrial process, and to use it for meditation

and reflection about the purpose of this industrial process and of our social structures in general.

However, it happens that, in my country too, thousands of young people are unemployed. As a Minister for Culture, I have proposed that this period of enforced inactivity should not be allowed to become a breeding ground for frustration and negative attitudes, but that instead this unexpected and on the whole undesirable pause in the tempo of life of young workers and university graduates should be used as an opportunity to make a few corrections to the stereotyped training which these young people receive, which is geared entirely to efficiency. We have therefore proposed setting up **creativity workshops**. This is not intended as a kind of "leisure therapy" but rather as a test laboratory, a study centre for the purpose of devising a new kind of civilisation. Manual skills and study will be combined, so as to narrow the traditional gulf between manual and mental work; could one not say that this dichotomy bitterly resented in the past is one cause among others of the crisis in our western civilisation?

Following the same train of thought, we feel sure that in future permanent education can no longer be exclusively directed to developing the intellect, but will have to co-operate much more than in the past towards developing and cultivating feeling and imagination. For training like classical education has in the past been too much concerned with profit-earning capacity, too exclusively directed towards intellectualism.

It is clear that the new disposition of our thoughts and feelings which is the object of modern cultural action will lead us inevitably to a new organisation of our living space. To my mind, this is the second mission of current cultural policy: to create a living environment.

We have had European Architectural Heritage Year, and I can assure you that many people in Flanders, especially amongst the younger generation, devoted a great enthusiasm to it. Their efforts have continued; we are watching to see that there is not a reaction now, as so often happens at the end of these campaigns to arouse the public.

I think I can say that, after the campaign in favour of an active participation in sport, the campaign for preservation, restoration and integration of the human and natural environment raised extraordinary enthusiasm.

The creation of an environment suited to human needs responds to everyone's deepest aspirations I am convinced.

I have been struck by statements made by specialists regarding the importance of the environment for animals, and I am sure that man feels the link between him and his environment with the same intensity. It has been established that, with animals, everything is centred on habit, safety, knowledge of a limited territory and the most perfect adaptation possible to that environment. It seems that from the very beginning of its life, an animal weaves a kind of web of fixed relations with its environment, made up in part from instinctive feelings and in part from learnt reactions; in this way he builds up a system of links which enable his organism to function properly.

If all this is true we must conclude that preservation of the environment is an important objective for man as well, and so one of the main tasks which our society must undertake is to organise its environment.

In a rather individualistic spirit we have for a long time given priority to our housing. There is no doubt that this was essential and important. In so far as the aim was to ensure human happiness and wellbeing, it was necessary to make sure that all classes of the population had suitable and attractive housing.

Unlike some other countries, we have to a large extent succeeded in this. There is a good standard of housing in Flanders: homes are spacious and comfortable.

But it is high time that we look to other priorities, if we wish to preserve what we have already achieved; it would be unfortunate if, as the result of excessive or uncontrolled development, the results attained were put at risk.

As elsewhere in Europe, war damage on the one hand and the demands of modern life on the other hand (central heating, bathrooms, etc.) have led us to put up new buildings. There is an old saying that every Belgian has a brick in his stomach. Certainly, this trend has been more pronounced among us than in neighbouring countries.

One of our oldest Flemish poems says that "every bird has his nest but thou and I". It is hard to imagine a more convincing application for a building licence.

Either for economic reasons or because it was the current architectural trend, in recent decades multiple-storey buildings have gone up all over the place, in every price range.

No doubt splendid green spaces were planned each time. In practice, however, the initial intentions were often reduced by the end of the work to pocket-handkerchief lawns.

At the same time the centres of our big cities, and even of some country towns, were gradually abandoned, bringing about a slow deterioration of the urban landscape.

Soon there was not much green space left, exhaust fumes and road-widening brought about large-scale destruction of trees and other plants. Even the smallest parks and green corners disappeared, for lack of the attention they needed and which nobody gave them.

Courtyards and gardens were turned into parking spaces in accordance indeed with regulations issued by well-intentioned authorities.

As for the animals (first the horses and cattle, then the cats and dogs and now even the pigeons), which are a necessary part of any scene, they suffered a scarcely better fate.

The urban area was transformed into an asphalt landscape, unattractive and impossible to live in. Children grew up without any contact with nature. All that was left in the town centres was the older generation, who did not always have the money needed to maintain the old buildings. Flat-dwellers began to suffer from various of the illnesses of civilisation, such as tower-block neurosis. What were the consequences?

The urban population, whose traditional environment had been spoilt, spread out into the country, looking for second homes – sometimes a simple fisherman's hut, sometimes a luxury villa – and so began to ruin the countryside, wreck beauty spots and eat into the green spaces, thus destroying the only real sanctuary left to recreation.

It is clear that at this stage **priority** must be given to preserving **urban landscapes**. Their **renewal** is not only a matter of preserving monuments, but must be looked at from a wider angle.

We must make our towns more pleasant to live in, and for this purpose we must re-establish small green areas agreeable to look at and suitable for rest; we must plant trees (and be more tolerant towards animals) and we must provide playgrounds for little and big children alike.

But housing is nevertheless what matters most.

We must put an end to this mania for demolition and highrise buildings. That means that existing housing which is often dilapidated and no longer suited to modern needs, must be adapted and converted.

The well-being of those who live in the old parts of towns is paramount. We reject the idea that every stone which is 75 years old or more must stay where it is. Well-planned renovation of urban landscapes involves no conflict between the different objectives of decent housing for the inhabitants, preservation of the environment and protection of the historic and artistic setting and the general appearance of the area.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am convinced that where the environment is concerned similar tendencies are apparent in many countries of Europe. The preservation of monuments is obviously one means of promoting the quality of life.

Lastly I should like to make an appeal for a special effort in all countries to obviate the risk of a period of reaction, which would bring to nought all the work done during the campaigns we have conducted in these last few years to make the general public aware of the problems.

I am not a great believer in the irreversibility of things. There is no doubt that there is a tendency towards reaction. I can already see it happening where Women's Year is concerned. I believe that women can also help to improve the quality of life; in that, as the philosopher Roger Garaudy put it, they have restored to our western civilisation a femine dimension which implies the opposite of male destructiveness and the all-powerfulness of technology.

Address by Mr L. Wilhelmsen
Director General
Ministry of Church and Education, Norway

In her very interesting introduction to our Theme, the Belgian Minister for Dutch Culture laid great stress on action to protect our natural and cultural heritage against the dangers of modern technology and human greed and short-sightedness. In the case of the cultural heritage, this protection is one of the oldest elements of cultural policy in Europe, and the need for it is ever increasing as time goes on.

However, in a small country like Norway, and perhaps also in some other countries not so small, this policy of defence does not stop with the protection of the past. In some cases it is also necessary to defend the present and the future, to defend a national creative activity whose existence is being threatened because the national market is proving too small under modern conditions. Film production, so rightly mentioned by the Finnish Minister, is a case in point, and Norway has found it necessary to secure the making of Norwegian feature films in a sufficient number by giving general support to the film industry. Governmental support of the press is another example. For the last 12 years, however, we have given similar general support to Norwegian literature – apart from the support given to authors as artists – and I think we can say after 12 years that the system has worked with excellent results.

We believe, then, that in a country like ours the defence against commercialisation, rightly stressed by the Swedish Minister, cannot be only a defence against bad quality. It must also be a defence, an attempt to preserve national values against international uniformity because we believe that certain activities are necessary for any nation that is going to keep its individuality. However, when discussing Cultural Policy as a means of improving the quality of life in town and country communities it is important that we do not only pay attention to a policy of defence. Our European past, both before and after the

industrial revolution, is not good enough for that. And in any case both town and country are changing, and to meet this process of change, we must have a positive cultural policy, just as much as we need an industrial policy, a social policy and an educational policy, if it is going to benefit individuals and the societies to which they belong.

There are three particular types of European communities and of Norwegian communities that offer special problems and special opportunities:

Firstly, there are the rural areas whose population is decreasing under the impact of mechanisation and the emphasis on technical efficiency of agriculture and the fishing industry or other special problems.

Secondly, we have new industrial towns springing up around new factories or other establishments.

And thirdly we have the suburbs, housing more and more of the growing populations of the existing urban centres.

It is our experience in Norway that the satisfaction of cultural needs of these and other changing localities is an essential part of the task of total development.

It is also our experience, alas, that these needs have very often been overlooked for too long, and that they can only be treated by political measures and political action. I shall not, of course, go into details about our Norwegian efforts which are described in the documentation, but while our attempts to tackle these problems are still only a beginning, they are at any rate now being tackled as part of a coherent policy.

Let me just say a few words about the general character of the task. If we mean anything when we stress the **larger** concept of culture, this task must be a double one. On the one hand we must see to it that the communities in question are getting their proper share of the traditional elite culture, which it is part of our cultural policy to democratise. In other words these communities must be equipped, along with the facilities for other purposes, with the necessary space for theatrical performances, for cinemas, for exhibitions and so on, and of course programmes must be provided for them. In Norway, we have tried to make the new communities, or the oppressed communities, partners in our traditional culture; we have also offered to help artists settle in such places, offers which make it possible, and even tempting for them to live and work there instead of in the crowded centres where most of them are to be found.

However, on the other hand a balanced cultural policy must, and, I think, first of all, provide facilities and encouragements for a

harmonious development of the pattern of sub-cultural activities of all types, including sports, which form the natural social environment of us all, and which for the majority perhaps is their culture and must be allowed to continue to be their culture – to be refined and cultivated, yes, but not to be replaced as "not good enough".

A local cultural policy of this double type must be based on a government cultural policy. Central initiatives are needed not only for the planning of it, but, at any rate in my country, government initiative is also needed for financial assistance, particularly for the poorer localities, and above all it is needed in order to establish travelling cultural institutions to tour the theatres, concert-rooms, lecture rooms and even cinemas of some of the local centres. However, in the opinion of the Norwegian Government – and I might add of all political parties – it is equally certain that the cultural democracy for which we strive must be based on a high degree of local self-government in cultural matters. The present government's subventions to local government activities in municipalities and countries are therefore not earmarked for special purposes, or special districts within the community, and they are given almost without any strings attached to them at all. In other words, we think that cultural policy should be adapted to the community, not the community to the policy. The main safeguard against misuse is perhaps the demand on the local councils to set up proper organs for cultural matters and the necessary staff to administer them.

We believe that it is in this positive sector of our policies that we have most to learn from each other, because so little has been settled here; and I would have liked to have heard of the methods employed in Belgium; we heard too brief and too few mentions of institutions which seem to be of great general interest. I think also that other speakers in the continued debate would be of help to us all if they gave us their experience or their opinions on these very relevant and very typical matters in our cultural policy.

Address by Mrs Zeni Björklund, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, Sweden

We in Sweden find one aspect of Theme II particularly interesting. It concerns the activities labelled "animation socio-culturelle" and the working conditions for groups and people who are involved in this type of activity. In Sweden we have the same difficulties as we read about in the Mennell report to find a Swedish equivalent for this French word – so far with no luck – so we are still using in Sweden the imported term and we think that this translation problem illustrates something of the ambiguity of the concept "animation socio-culturelle". Nevertheless, several of the experiments with "animation socio-culturelle" that have begun are very interesting because they contribute new material to the continuing debate in many countries as to how more and more citizens are to be given increased opportunities for taking an active part in the development of society. Most of us in our countries are reappraising old methods and decision-making patterns. A cultural politician may well feel dubious at times whether all this really has to do with "cultural" policy. Actually what we have here is a concerted equality policy where other policy makers in the fields of social welfare, housing, industry and industrial relations ought to be brought in to help gain experiences for future reform work.

I do not intend to get bogged down in a new debate on our enlarged concept of culture and how practical and useful this is in everyday cultural policy work. But the demand to meet problems actively in different social sectors before they actually exist, generates a need for a clear-cut division of responsibility between different political areas. But, at the same time, this division harbours the danger that we shall lose sight of the wood for the trees. In other words, can we really be sure that everything being done in our societies really proceeds from a holistic philosophy to give priority to mans' needs?

Even if this is so, we find it hard to see that the best way of management in this area is to declare all these activities to be cultural enterprises, and for the cultural politicians to assume all responsibility. We think that some of animation's good intentions and long term vision would go by the board. After all, "animation socio-culturelle" is supposed to affect all sectors of society, so that in successive areas one reaches out to broad groups of citizens, examining and improving the activity by constructive proposals for change. We must therefore increase co-operation between cultural policy and other political areas. In current efforts at co-operation, the cultural area is often the weaker party and hence becomes humble and deferential. This is, surely, reinforced by the fact that the cultural area has long lacked a firm political objective and has been beset by a weak, fragmented organisation. And we need these political objectives and organisation not only at a national level. Every municipality must have its own cultural policy decided by the political assembly in the municipality or the region. And we have to involve the political parties in that work. Our own experience at the central level in Sweden has shown how the formulation of goals and action programmes by the ruling party also has to activate the opposition parties in this matter.

The aspects of the animation experiments that we find particularly interesting touch on the Belgian Minister's comments in her introduction. Several projects using "animation socio-culturelle" are in favour of turning the arts into tools of everyday life. The experiments tell us that art has been used as a language to enable groups to formulate jointly their own experiences and thoughts. The fact that these expressions are not confined to the spoken or written word, but also make use of pictures, films, music and other expressive media has resulted in more voices being heard. But art is also a greatly under-estimated source of knowledge. Besides immediate experience of life, art is perhaps our foremost instrument for learing about conditions in our societies. Art conveys not only hard facts but also genuine sentiments and as such lays groundwork for a real understanding of what was previously unknown. And in our opinion, a greater use of art as an educational resource is an important task in the work of developing cultural policy.

I should like now to deal with one problem. The modus operandi of animation projects entails obligation. If people are to be prevailed upon to get together to formulate their own experiences and to demand changes they must be enabled to put teeth into their words. The things they say must be taken seriously and be allowed to feed through to the reform work: this is especially important for the groups who have long

been silent, and too isolated to express their demands. Otherwise there is a risk that many of today's promising prospects of animation will strike back in a backlash of disappointment which leads to political apathy. In our view, therefore, it is important to have the projects linked to, or be on good working terms with, those channels which exist in society for debate and opinion moulding. In Sweden for example we find it natural to tie these types of activities to our popular movements. The people who run the activity or programme should disclose the ideological philosophy which motivates them. They should also be accessible to criticism and democratic control. This is one way of keeping the programme from developing under an authoritarian leadership, albeit in more acceptable forms. As we see it, many of the experiments so far have been overdependent on a single person or a single group; many of the projects have indeed been brilliant experiments, but they have found it hard to survive as soon as the initial enthusiasm is no longer enough to cope with all the set-backs encountered. All this obviously postulates that society's support for this type of work must be based on a basic trust in those who run the programme. Such trust is important because many of the experiments show that one can work without bureaucratic control and regulation. Assistance should be rendered even at times where the programme looks like coming to a sad end. The leaders of animation projects are each different, and the conditions vary between countries and this means that it is hard to see people who work with these types of activities as a homogeneous group. Many times they are so dissimilar that a common descriptive label like animators may seem repugnant, not least to those so labelled. We therefore think it is impossible to envisage a uniform education training of the group called animateurs. On the other hand we think that a great deal could be gained if different countries were to arrange meetings from time to time where those people could get together to exchange experiences. That would certainly be inspiring and conducive to the project work, and here perhaps the Council of Europe is in a position to play an active role, especially if the meetings are not burdened with demands for formulations and joint recommendations.

Address by Mr Richard Burke, Minister for Education, Ireland

In reading through the documentation prepared for the Conference, I came across the expression by experts, of a number of opinions which have left me profoundly uneasy. May I quote one of them by way of introduction to my general remarks: –

> "We have seen that school does not lead to culture, since it develops convergent thinking whereas all creativity is rooted in divergent thinking."

If, in fact the position is as stated in this quotation, then I fear that the conference is not leading to culture because it has tended to develop convergent thinking. I wish to contest this convergent thinking, as it appears to be developing during the course of the conference, if only to provide a corrective to the repetition of certain theses in regard to culture which I regard as unacceptable.

As a Minister representing Ireland I am not prepared to accept an understanding of a role which would have the Ministers reject the rich cultural heritage of Europe in favour of the mass produced article placed before them with the alluring title of cultural democratisation. Many of the preparatory documents which I have read have left me with a sense of unease. I am well aware that to quote a brief extract from any author is by definition, to take the matter out of context. In the circumstances of the short time which the rules of the Conference allow me I considered however, that it is appropriate to cite certain quotations as cumulatively indicating tendencies in the documentation which are presumably designed to stimulate interest and invite a response from Ministers.

The quotations are as follows: –

> "The point is to throw down a challenge to the heritage concept of culture and replace it with one that leaves the definition and culture to the people."

"We no longer speak of cultural dissemination but of cultural animation."

"Unquestionably this transition from dissemination to animation, from democratisation to democracy is a real cultural revolution."

One could multiply these quotations. The message which comes home to me is that it is considered a feature of Occidental society, particularly European society, to see culture as something relevant to a separate area of life – to sensitivity in creativity in certain specific fields which are regarded as of special significance in determining the quality of life as a whole. The elitist concept of a highly personalised activity is not the do-it-yourself, weekend painter, pots and pans, let's-appeal-to-the-masses type of activity. It is a concept of culture which is artistic rather than social. This is a more limited concept of culture than that tacitly assumed by the experts who have given the conference the benefit of their thoughts in the preparatory documentation. And I wish to challenge the assumption of the need for a new approach to the traditional concept of culture, if only to alter the onus of proof. Those who would wish us as Ministers to depart from the traditional European concept must surely accept this onus of establishing their position.

It is fashionable nowadays to accept certain theses, propounded in the name of progressive rhetoric, irrespective of the objective merit of the theses themselves. The following quotations illustrate the point:

"All those forces which are opposed to the new cultural dynamism emerging from the great mass of the people are represented by the constitutional powers and the bureaucratic apparatus which serves them. There is our enemy!"

"In all the cultural thought of today one can discern as a major trend a syndrome of mistrust and timidity, fear of tradition and fear of reliance upon any transcendental value or upon any faith or upon any proposition not validated by scientific research. Above all there is fear of the appearance of elitism."

I would like to sound a note of caution. Experts have a habit of progressing into their labyrinthine mazes of theory in a manner which takes them away from the realms of experience of the common man. And it is our duty, as elected representatives of the common people to act as a corrective to this theorising. If we give our acceptance to resolutions based on definitions of culture which deny our European people the value of their cultural inheritance in favour of some alternative, banal product, we would be encouraging forces which would make it difficult to maintain standards of value.

Much of the difficulty has arisen from the importation of the anthropologists' use of the word culture into the field of cultural policy. In the documentation that so used the word, culture means the behavioural norms and mores and values and attitudes and rules and taboos which make the framework of life in any given society. In that sense of the word, a refrigerator, or skittles in a pub is as cultural as a Parthenon freize or an opera. I cannot accept this approach to culture and invite those colleagues who agree with me to state clearly their views in this regard and bring a degree of common sense and reason to bear on the proceedings of this first meeting of European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs.

The Vice-President of the Conference has suggested that we are inclined to forget the role of the child. I agree entirely with this observation, and also with some references in the same regard made by may Icelandic colleague, who suggested that the way to overcome the apathy which exists in societies towards the artistic in life is to stress increasingly the pivotal position of education and the development of cultural consciousness. I am glad to be able to inform the Conference that a new approach to primary education in Ireland has placed the emphasis on creativity in all the art forms, and at the level of secondary education, a project called "The transition year" affords great hope for the future. This Transition Year is placed between the junior cycle and senior cycle studies at the age of 15½ to 16½ years. A number of schools have been asked to enter a pilot scheme in which the formal subjects, be they academic or technical or scientific in emphasis, are set aside for a year in order to allow the teachers and students to concentrate on a broadly cultural approach. A greater link with the outside community makes this project in effect the beginning of adult education. A programme of participation in, and appreciation of, the high arts is accompanied by a study of what is called "media criticism" which aims at enabling the pupils to reject the passive approach to entertainment, especially TV, and to provide them with the critical sense to reject the materialistic values sometimes portrayed.

It is to be hoped that the Transition Year will, over a period of time, be seen as the first year of adult education. It is aimed at the age group 15½ to 16½ because this is the point at which young people are required to decide to enter further secondary education at senior level, or enter apprenticeship, or direct employment. This means that the programme is truly transitionary to further study, to life or to apprenticeship.

In this way, over a period of time it should be possible to improve the quality of life for people in towns and countryside, and

thus overcome the inevitable tendency to apathy towards cultural matters.

If we do not encourage young people to stand aside for a short period of life, and stare at fundamental aspects of life, how can we hope to arouse in them a feeling for self-expression which will find an outlet in the highest forms of artistic expression?

Address by Mr R. Krieps, Minister for Cultural Affairs, Luxembourg

I have been prompted to take the floor by the Irish representative's statements on which I should like to comment. Our colleague first raises the question of the value of the assertions or observations made in our documents. As it will probably be easy enough for the experts to answer that, I should like to refer to the statement in the speech of the Belgian Minister for Dutch Culture and Flemish Affairs to the effect that the path leading to the crossroads which civilisation has reached started in the spring of 1968, so that by 1978, it will be obvious that we have passed through a decade of decisive historical importance. I do not know what the situation was in Ireland in 1968, but I feel that any cultural policy which existed at the time went bankrupt during that year. I also believe that the experts who drafted the documents for this conference were able to study profitably these events which almost brought Europe to the brink of cultural and social revolution, and at any rate placed us in extremely critical situations. In this respect, I feel it is unfair to critise the experts.

Moreover, who are the experts? They are our national experts, specialists whom we have chosen in part and who have worked on behalf of the states which meet within the Council of Europe. They have addressed themselves to a problem and imparted their findings to us. I, therefore, feel that it is entirely appropriate to this meeting that they have given us food for thought. This does not mean that everything they have said is immediately acceptable politically. Nevertheless, I believe that the judgement expressed by the Irish representative regarding the experts, who are unable to reply here, was both unfair and unduly harsh.

If cultural action was not called for, I do not see why we should be meeting today. There has been socio-cultural animation for 2,000 years; the Church has engaged in it. It is therefore nothing new, and where a gap exists or an old policy has failed, it is now the state

which takes up the problem. I feel they are perfectly entitled, as was stressed by the United Kingdom representative, to work for the formulation of a cultural policy which will filter down to lower levels where local authorities can implement it. In any case, we must think about it, and steps must be taken to define a cultural policy adapted to existing needs. I am, therefore, far from convinced of the justice of the Irish representativ's judgement.

As regards elitism, I am indeed aware that in some countries, Ireland for instance, culture is mainly transmitted in a language which is not that of the country. This is also true of Luxembourg; Norway and Finland have made similar comments. Where culture is not transmitted in the mother tongue of the mass of the population, I believe a real problem exists and there are good grounds for cultural action. Therefore, I feel that the experts who have submitted their opinions were justified in framing them as they have, in order to provoke reflection and discussion.

We should continue to weigh the problems confronting us, neither yielding to resignation nor allowing ourselves to be swept up by the new wave of nostalgia for periods irrevocably passed.

Address by Mr Louis Escande, Mayor of Mâcon Vice-Chairman of the Cultural Committee of the Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe

Cultural activities play a major role in the predominantly urban European society of today. Over the past few decades, the town has become the normal setting of most people's lives in our countries. This process of rapid urbanisation has resulted in an impairment of the urban environment, which has in its turn, given rise to feelings of social alienation.

It is thanks to the debate and dialogue which it stimulates that culture in the modern sense of the term makes possible the positive development of society at all levels. The most striking fact appears to me to be that under the pressure of socio-economic circumstances the former modes of integration seem to have disappeared. In a word, we must not allow debate to be replaced by non-communication or the economy to go one way while culture goes another.

I think that the choice of values and priorities is becoming of great importance nowadays. We have reached a turning-point, and now is perhaps the moment for Europe to consider some fundamental questions about the meaning of life and to seek to define values which lie beyond material progress.

One of these values, cultural property, must be made accessible to all strata of the population, it being one of the functions of local authorities to promote the cultural advancement of society, thereby enabling education to be focused on Europe and leisure pursuits to be organised in a way that enriches individual lives, as part of the general effort to improve the quality of life.

The steady increase in the responsibilities of municipalities and regions in the cultural field clearly reflects the fact that it is local and regional communities rather than the state that are the natural centre of cultural life. Of significance in this respect is the spread of spontaneous ventures such as the setting-up of groups or associations to defend minority cultures and languages, often in response to a specific local problem.

Local and regional councillors with responsibility for cultural affairs consequently have an important part to play in the framing of cultural policies, and they should be helped to define and improve their role in this field, so that such policies may as equitably and rationally as possible meet the needs and aspirations of the various sectors of society, particularly the least privileged. And it must not be forgotten that any arrangements made for supporting and promoting cultural activities cannot be fully effective unless backed up by the dynamism of the local or regional authorities which advocated or encouraged them.

A first priority must obviously be the promotion and development of the current policy of preserving and renewing the European cultural heritage in all the regions and localities concerned.

The basis of cultural education is a knowledge of the countless treasures of the past to which Europe has made a particularly important contribution through the creativity of its successive civilisations. Against a background of rapid economic and social change, this knowledge will enable human communities to produce new treasures inspired by past traditions.

At a level closer to the individual citizen, the preservation of the environment is linked to the need to protect mankind from the onslaughts of modern life. Human beings are concerned to ensure their own security. A certain "joie de vivre" is one of the necessary stages on the road to human happiness. The past preserved in all its richness, the social setting safeguarded in its most noble aspects, the natural environment enhanced and maintained – all these help to increase the quality of urban life. The extent to which they do so will vary according to the economic, and hence social, circumstances of each region and will also be dependent on leisure opportunities and on the efforts made by local authorities in this regard. These differences are very often responsible for the inferiority complexes of so-called under-developed regions and local authority areas.

*
* *

This was in fact the subject of one of the important recommendations unanimously adopted by the 300 or so political representatives and spokesmen attending the **First Convention of the Authorities of European Peripheral Regions**, held at Galway (Ireland) from 14 to 16 October 1975. The convention, which was convened at the instance of the Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, pointed out that it would be dangerous to neglect the less favoured regions of Europe in our mainly urban civilisation and that it was therefore appropriate:

"To take the necessary measures for the protection and revitalisation of the languages and cultures which are often threatened by extinction in ethnic peripheral communities. These measures should be inspired by the European norms concerning the respect of cultural minorities. The competent committees and departments of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe should examine this question, if necessary by creating an ad hoc committee, and study the institutional and financial provisions which could be taken to this end, in matters of education and cultural policy, both at the European level and at the level of each state concerned."

Is the term "cultural minority" in fact really acceptable? Is it not often in smaller human communities that one finds the art of living in its purest and richest forms as well as the truest works of art?

*
* *

By way of immediate practical action, it would be desirable if governments could help local and regional authorities:

- to preserve, conserve and restore regional and local cultural assets, particularly those in under-developed regions;
- to undertake community development of the type which leads to the real discovery of man in his past and present creativity and which encourages individuals to express themselves and communicate with each other spontaneously;
- to foster the training of cultural organisers and encourage the conclusion of contracts or charters for that purpose between central governments and local authorities;
- to encourage participation by citizens in decisions affecting their environment as a prerequisite of the preservation of the quality of life.

At the same time, however, these new-found democratic freedoms surely preclude all sterile, persistent opposition from militant political minorities whose principal aim seems to be to call in question the very existence of democracy and hence of liberty itself.

*
* *

In conclusion, what I have been saying reflects our constant concern to unify Europe on the basis of the various regions, according to each one's possibilities and with due respect for its specific character.

Europe has nothing to hide and can only benefit by becoming better known in both its greatnesses and its weaknesses.

Nor is it enough to interpret echoes received from afar. The Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, which I have the honour of representing here, sprang from this highly practical, concrete principle. I hope that, thanks to this first Conference of European Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs, the cultural policy of Europe will engage the attention and attract the help of all those who, by virtue of their local or regional responsibilities, their official positions or their professional activities, have occasion to discover or make known as fully as possible what is going on in the community and what is at stake.

THEME III

Encouraging Artistic Creation

Introductory address by Mr M. Guy, Minister for Culture, France

To begin with, I would like to define the framework of our discussions. We had agreed to confine ourselves to public aid for creation in the field of plastic and graphic arts. However, this does not mean that music, the theatre or the cinema pose less considerable or less urgent problems. Next year, they too will have to be entered in the Council of Europe's study programmes.

The same applies to the situation of the arts and crafts which should be examined in the near future in order to ensure that they are properly safeguarded and renewed.

But for the time being we shall deal with public aid for creation in the field of plastic arts.

Mutual agreement has already been reached on the principle of public aid. We know that creative art in all its forms must be present in our everyday world. We are living in technological, utilitarian societies, obsessed by production, doomed to uniformity and, to a great extent, disenchanted. The disenchantment of the "haves" is certainly not the same as that of the "have nots"; nevertheless, our societies, because they are democratic, therefore equalitarian in principle, if not yet in reality, must assure everybody's right to aesthetic pleasure. Ugliness is a crime against the faith man may have in his works. Thus it is in contradiction with any success of the social contract. Not everybody, of course, has the gift of increasing the beauty that exists in the world. But it is essential to enable everybody to increase the capacity for perception of that beauty. And it is essential that the creators who do increase, renew and communicate it, should be enabled to do so. It is not merely a duty, it is in the interest of every individual.

The logic of our mass production systems tends, alas, to permit quantity to prevail over quality, conformity over difference, passive

consumption over creative initiative. Furthermore, the original, often radical treatment that artists may apply to our standard vision of the world, can lead to unpleasant surprises and traumatic effects. Therefore, the most genuine innovative artists – and I do not refer to incidental innovations that disappear with fashion – are in their majority, and in particular the youngest, ill-known and even feared. In any event, they are condemned to a precarious, financial existence and a marginal social position. Their situation is like that of the cavemen who stoned those who tried to reveal a new, true vision of things.

In fact, it is the duty of public authorities to act when the general interest is involved and when individual criteria lead to confusion. That is the case of creative art in our society. We do not require merely computer-analysts, but also dancers. Plastic artists promote the present-day quality of living and are the artisans of our future heritage. It is a state duty to provide hem with support.

It has been acknowledged that art must be taken out of its shrine, and the gap between it and its beholder be abolished. Now, the gap between professional and amateur must also disappear. And so must anything leading to the belief that culture and art are only the concern of a small minority. That is why it is not sufficient merely to encourage the creator to create. Creation must be shown as being everywhere, even in the ordinary things of our daily life. Artists will not be properly integrated into society unless art is really integrated into life itself.

Another no less difficult integration must be carried out at all costs. A minimum material security without which no continuous activity is possible, must be provided, in order to achieve that independence of conception and expression, failing which no innovative and living art can exist. And this has to be done in such a way that the minimum security, due to any person who works, should not weigh like an odious yoke on a work so different from any other. The artists' deep self-denial and brave acceptance of the hardest sacrifices are not found anywhere else to the same extent. Nor is their proud, inflexible refusal of anything that might change or distort the free meaning of the works. Accordingly, public authorities when dealing with artists, must show a kind of deference or tact so as to avoid the slightest suspicion of mandatory action. Furthermore, except in the cases of academic and official art (which to our mind, are no longer wanted), the only initiatives worthy of support are those that imply a note of error and that can claim the risk of making a mistake. This shows the extent of the credit afforded by public authorities to really deserving creative activity. The artist poses the state more delicate

problems than anything else. To define these, we shall have to pose some concrete questions.

Insurance against human risks is possible. But can the artist be insured against the risks of his life as an artist? Can he be insured against his creative taste not being appreciated? Can he be insured against his own weariness after all the courage, invention and strength to renew that were first required of him? And to begin with, can his livelihood be insured? And if it is, how would he be considered? As a producer of goods which although cultural are nonetheless economic? Or as a producer of a service? The one does not exclude the other. In the first case, is it necessary for public authorities to increase the amount of public purchase, use financial incentives to encourage private purchasers, and at least cover payment for loans of works of art? In the second case, the scope of likely jobs for artists ranges from educational duties and artistic interpreation to the overall duties implied by the term "development of the living framework".

What kind of remuneration should then be envisaged? An annual salary similar to that received by teachers in the Civil Service in France; or fees, like architects who belong, in the majority, to the so-called "liberal" professions?

Furthermore, the word "professional" poses a serious problem. Professional artists certainly have priority in the allocation of public aid. However, the elastic frontier separating the amateur from the professional artist must not be ignored. Nor must the fact be underestimated that the amateur may have audacity and genius; therefore, being a professional is not a guarantee in itself. Besides, what kind of professional status do the artists want?

Can the idea be accepted of artists receiving a salary from the state, permanently and to some extent unconditionally, i.e. regardless of any result? The state only remunerates individuals under specific, equal recruitment conditions, essentially non-discriminatory. What criteria would therefore be borne in mind? Diplomas? Exhibitions? Works in museums or on the free market? Ancillary teaching or interpretation activities? Finally, the crucial question: who would judge the standard of the works or the services supplied?

Here we refer to the preparatory works of the Council of Europe, notably of the sociologist, Raymonde Moulin. In "Public Aid for Creation in the Plastic Arts", she explains the need for pluralism in levels of professional status, the criteria for joining the profession, and for the selection bodies.

All this shows a great desire for justice which we applaud. But the reality of vocation and genius must not be overlooked. Regardless of the popular myth of the poor, forsaken artist, should he not also be protected from the inevitable pitfalls of a professional status. And so I ask, should we not opt for the most autonomous and noble professional status, although the most fraught with problems: the independent professional?

In that case, should the artists be guaranteed a kind of minimum income?

This minimum income need not be a minimum salary unconditionally guaranteed; it could be modulated according to various methods of remuneration adapted to each case: grants, purchases, payment for loans of works of art, temporary salaries, or fees, whereby a specified supply of services for a specific period could be remunerated.

In any event, whatever the adopted formula for remuneration, the public authority's first obligation is to acknowledge that artists are entitled to social benefits: sickness and old-age insurance, unemployment allowances, etc. Nobody disputes this right. But another problem remains. In view of their irregular income and the special nature of their activities, should artists be affiliated to the general system of contributions and services or should they benefit from a special system, and if so, which? Whether a general or special system, the same problem arises concerning the taxation of income.

To the problem of income from creative activity should be attached the problem of the guarantees that must be assured, at national and international levels, of the creators' rights on the distribution of their works: reproduction rights and the right to proceeds from the work (droit de suite), linked to successive transactions, and the additional value resulting therefrom, and customs dues adjusted to the new materials of creative art.

The question of the material advantages granted to some artists may also arise. I refer to artists' studios. As France expended energy on this line in recent years, I can state that I have some knowledge of the problems they pose. Should collective or individual studios prevail? Should they be conceived as artists' centres integrated or not into the urban fabric? Is it advisable to encourage a specific construction for these studios, or should artists be persuaded to rebuild on disused sites, or use buildings enriched by the patina of time? Should one run the risk, by setting up focal points of seething creation of artists' communities thriving on confrontation and fruitful competition of

actually segregating the artist from the general public? Or on the contrary, should one run the risk of the artist, integrated in the common medium, becoming sterile from his isolation? Any social action on behalf of creators actually depends on such lucidly posed, bravely faced questions. In any event, a measure would be beneficial for the artists if it encouraged a better knowledge of their situation and artistic activity and made their works more familiar, thus providing an incentive for acquisition both by private individuals and communities.

Anything that can remove the vague, but powerful, concept that artists belong to another world, anything that can foster mobility of their works and greater familiarity with them, would integrate art in everyday life and the artist in the community.

How can this be achieved? May one, can one create a kind of public market of plastic arts, distinct from the private market, and which in some respects would compete with it? Should fiscal exemptions encourage private entities – firms, for instance, to acquire works of art? Should private patronage be fostered with the aid of mechanisms similar to those of the Foundations that have been so wide-spread in North America recently? How should the increasing demand for antiques be met in such a market? Or the speculative nature, the varied artistic concerns of so many collections? Or the proliferation of forgeries?

We must go further in our intention to assign the creative artist his place in the community. The use of works of art in public buildings must be systematised; they could be a means of information for the whole urban space. Creative artists and their works must likewise be present in the audio-visual media.

The activity of the plastic arts is the modelling of the whole visual environment. As a technician specialising in the problems of plastic or graphic standards, the plastic artist should not be omitted, at least as a consultant, from any decision-making on everyday environment. Whatever difficulties this may raise, his responsibility must be increased in regard to the build-up area in general and the place of work in particular. It is no longer a matter of adorning a home with a work of art reassuring the vitality of civilisation. Homes, the whole habitat, the town itself, hey must all show that they were conceived by and for individuals. When this basic link is endorsed, art is easily integrated into life itself, and society easily accommodates the artist. The latter will have already modelled its form.

The prospect of integrating the creative artist in society will be radically changed when the modelling of our own sensitivity is

accepted as one of his main tasks. It is no longer a matter of the plastic artist merely shaping clay or stone, but of shaping our own receptivity as well. The awakening and education of our sensitivity is not specifically the creator's task. Nevertheless, nobody is likely to carry it out better than he. In conjunction with this task of the cultural education and interpretation of children there must be relaxation of the over-rigid framework in which legislation may confine the creative artist. The solution would be to establish far closer contacts between the general public and works of art which, in fact, are designed to attract the largest amount of people.

These are some of the major issues for discussion. What are our main purposes? Is it actually possible to fix such purposes? How can they be adjusted to the artists' undeniably precarious means of livelihood?

We might examine them at two levels: the policy of member states and that of international co-operation.

It is not my duty to tell you how national policies should consider and solve these issues. I would just like to say that I find it essential that both financial questions and that of the recognition of a professional status for artists, be resolved on the lines of plurality and non-permanence: plurality of financial sources and selection bodies, the latter's membership being frequently changed in particular in respect of artists and experts. Several countries have adopted this solution, which I consider very sound.

We should, in any case, assert the need to set up a social welfare system for professional artists, to guarantee these artists' moral and property rights, including the right proceeds from the sale of artistic works, and provide the appropriate fiscal or customs regulation. Finally, we should develop and widen financial aids to research and artistic production. I consider it essential that we should adopt a recommendation to this effect, and take the liberty of insisting on this point.

A recommendation should also be made to include artists in architectural and town projects, in schools and universities, and to increase commissions of works of art and exhibitions in the least favoured regions.

Address by Mr Gunnar Svensson, Head of the Department of Cultural Affairs, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, Sweden

In our view, the measures the state takes to improve the circumstances of artists must form an integral part of the overall cultural policy. These measures must be based on the needs and circumstances of the artists, but they must at the same time be subordinated to the general aims for cultural policy. This should place the interplay between the artist and his audience in the foreground. This implies that the fundamental element in stimulating artistic creation is to enable the professional artist to earn a living from his ordinary work. Society should primarily concentrate its measures on increasing the opportunities for employment and improving the possibility of making use of artistic work and performances. Expressed in concrete terms, a stronger support of theatres, orchestras, film production, the radio and television gives the artists work and better living conditions.

For many artists, measures within the ordinary fields of work are however not enough. Society bears a responsibility to ensure that some artistic work may be pursued without necessarily paying immediate deference to its commercial value. Artists who do not receive a prompt response in the form of demand for their creations must be enabled to work under financially secure conditions. These needs can be met by having the state put funds at the direct disposal of individual artists as working allowances, or as support lent to projects of an expensive nature; e.g. the development of new technical methods. The parallels with resources we make available to different research areas should be obvious. Like the research workers the artists must enjoy considerable discretion when it comes to picking out problems and problem areas. We must also tolerate the possible failure of some experiments.

One very important point is the extension of artistic activity. One solution would be to put the artist in touch with new audience groups and to generate a dialogue between these groups and the artist. The ambitious should not grind to a halt as soon as culture is distributed to new groups. For the artists it is vital to share in the experiences and frames of reference of these new audiences and recipient groups. The form of this dialogue between artist and audience does not of course admit of a pat, clear-cut answer. That will depend on the art form involved, and the particular audience being addressed. A dramatist can write a play together with an amateur theatre group, a novelist can speak before an organisation about a book treating topics of the members' own experience. Visual artists together with people living in a residential area, can seek to illustrate positive and negative qualities in visual display form. Much of this type of work is natural and already established in artistic creation. If that is the case there is all the more cause for rejoicing that this type of enterprise should arise from the participants' own desires and without any centralised direction. The state's aim and that of municipal and county councils should be to facilitate and stimulate new initiatives by providing grants in various forms. Not least important will be the support of artist organisations which are dedicated to broadening and deepening the audience/artist relationship.

Another way to promote the growth of artistic creation is to find completely new kinds of activities. Where the visual artists are concerned, this could take the form of buying more paintings and sculptures to adorn work places, participation in the artistic design of public environment and of carrying out of tasks inside schools, and child-care centres. Where it comes to artistic design efforts should be made to bring this dimension into the initial planning stage so that it becomes an integral part of the work, modelling the whole visual environment as the introducing Minister expressed it. An interesting example of this is the design of the new underground stations in Stockholm, where visual artists were allowed to submit and work on their ideas before the installations were completely finished. The result has been the combination of artistic embellishment with architectural and technical solutions, rather than the superfluous addition of the former. These stations have become frequently visited show-rooms of good contemporary Swedish art. It is probably hard to find a better way to put the general public in touch with modern imagery.

Admitedly many visual artists do not wish to explore new working areas. They see their most important tasks in fields classified as traditional under the visual arts category. Work outside the studio is

seen by these artists as a subordinate activity as a means of earning a living and not as a vital ingredient of their artistic endeavour. This is an attitude we must accept if we treat freedom of expression for artists as a serious concept. Moreover in discussing enlarged working areas for the visual artists, we should also point out that the participation of professionally active visual artists in environment design, in education activity and in the proceedings of non-profit making organisations, to mention just a few examples, should not be primarily encouraged just because we want to give these people work and employment. The starting point instead must be to have these different areas express an explicit desire to introduce artistic elements. Not until such an attitude is established will we have any real ability to integrate the visual artists and their work into new situations.

To a great extent of course, whatever forms are chosen as new roles for the artist will depend on the traditions of government and public administration. May I refer to our wideranging attempts to make resources available in various forms, for example experimental and development work. Such resources should be at the disposal of not only those agencies which award grants to cultural enterprises and to artists, but also those specialised agencies responsible for such things as housing, education and child care. Having financial resources available from different specialised agencies will emphasise that the artistic enterprise and the artistic modes of expression should be seen as a cardinal and integral part of the activity in question. This is another of the many examples of the need to integrate cultural policy with activity in other sectors of society.

Address by Mr K. Egeland, Ministre of Church and Education, Norway

I first want to say a few words about the Norwegian Governmental proposition to make the conditions for creative artists a main political issue. The philosophy is that society needs art, and so society should ensure that the creative artists can do their job.

The proposed system is roughly explained in the supporting document.

I shall, however, recapitulate its main points:

- First, and foremost, that we must create a system for paying artists for what they do in, and for, society – i.e. pay them in real terms.
- Second: problems are inherent in creating a scheme of payment to enable people to use their time and talent in creative art, if that is their destiny. One such system could be a rather elaborate system of scholarships. Another could be guaranteed minimum income, and the government paper is really a combination of these and other systems. I do not want to take up any detailed discussion but stress two or three fundamental principles:

  a. The artist should be accepted as a person making a useful contribution to society, and – as I said – paid accordingly.

  b. Artistic qualifications should be the selective criteria when there are more artists than the scheme can accomodate for we do not see any possibility of dispensing with all limitations.

  c. The artists themselves should have a decisive voice in the matters, in both the design of the system and in the selection of artists through their organisations. That is to say, their negotiation rights should equal other groups in society.

d. The state as such should have no opinion whatsoever as to the form, the message or the contents of the arts created. That, of course, is to ensure a completely free creative art, just as research should be free. There should be no pressure from the top as to what they write, what they paint or what they compose. Quality should be the decisive criterion.

In conclusion, I stress that, above all, we should make a serious effort to improve the conditions of groups in society that have up to now been underprivileged in their possibility for creative activity. Such groups, as we know, may be living in the outskirts, by and large the underdogs of society. But also, there is half of the population, the women. There is no doubt, I believe, that being a creative artist and a woman makes special demands, and, at the same time, puts very special obstacles in the way of her artistic fulfilment. Our own literature, e.g. the works of Sigrid Undset and Cora Sandel demonstrates this. The latter especially, has written marvellous books about the conflict of being both woman and artist. The problem is just one of the general issues of women's liberation, but it is a very special problem for woman artists to develop their art within themselves, and within society. The Conference should not, in my opinion, pass without this being said.

Address by Mr H. Pousseur, Director of the Conservatoire Royal de Musique of Liege, Belgium

Artists are the aerials of the people.

They enable them to pick up messages which otherwise would not reach them. Messages coming from where, from whom? From reality, from the future, from the reality and the future of the people themselves, from the reality of the people such as they could and such as they desire to become.

Reality is strongly shaped by our imagination, by our **collective** imagination. We see the world as we were first taught to see it. We undertake to transform it on the basis of this early image and of the new images which arise in our mind through a process of continuous and organic elaboration. All this imagery has been formed and goes on being formed by painters, by story-tellers, who through it try to apprehend external reality. Perceived reality is where our common desire for identity is projected onto the dark backcloth of the world. It is enough to make a brief journey by air, to glance at the earth below, to note to what extent this projection can be physically effective. With the painters, there are also the architects, the road and bridge builders, who are working at naturels scale, as well as all the workmen who help them. As for the story-tellers, there are not only poets, novelists or journalists, but also musicians using their voice, composers discovering new sounds and hitherto unknown syntaxes, all those involved in reproducing, including the many listeners who see that these valuable idioms are kept alive within the common consciousness.

The solitary artist is therefore much less isolated than he thinks. Even acting as a beacon or a meteor, he still remains, if not rooted in the group from which he has emerged, at least marked by it, bearing its imprint, and sooner or later he will mark it in return.

Having said this, in very general and somewhat optimistic terms, one should add that artists nowadays, and current collective artistic activity, seem to be lacking an essential ingredient, to enable them to go on playing this part, to go on building pyramids or cathedrals, to invent disciplines as precise as perspective or anatomy and thus provide science with a starting point for great progress. On the other hand, our way of transforming the world has taken a pernicious turn, of which generalised pollution is only one of the symptoms. Could this missing ingredient, then, not be collective confidence in aesthetic values and is it not most clearly expressed in the divorce between the latter and economic practice? Although the need for artistic activities is widespread throughout our world, although young people, for instance, dream only of music and pictures (consider what a powerful narrative instrument they have in the cartoon-strip) our society, through its various decision-making bodies, does not give these activities the importance, and hence the means, they deserve and which they have received from practically all other societies in history.

Being a creative artist, a composer and theorist of experimental music, including music drama, and brought here in this capacity by my Minister, but also as the person recently responsible for the Conservatoire Royal of Liège, a great institution of artistic, musical and dramatic training, I am well placed to say this. For many years, in fact, experimental artists like myself have, at the cost of a considerable investment in terms of time and energy, undertaken animation activities with varying support, consisting not only of trying to disseminate artistic and even progressive products among increasingly large circles of the public, but also and above all of encouraging that public to participate creatively in the production of modern cultural concepts. Yet the help of the public authorities for this kind of operation, though far from non-existent and even at times displaying a somewhat paternalistic good will, is, nevertheless, proportionately tiny within cultural budgets which are themselves already tiny.

Generally speaking, the majority of aid goes to the prestige arts, like the opera, the great classical theatre, the great symphony orchestras, almost entirely at the expense of popular creative arts, such as might well emerge from **linking the most advanced research with the latent needs and abilities of collective creation.** Presumably, its usefulness is not apparent. How short-sighted! Are we not in this way losing the most essential instrument of self-definition? How will we be able without it to project before us a model to pull us out of the deadly torpor into which we have seriously begun to sink? If we would only devote to this survival operation, to this recovery of active

imagination, even a small part, say a tenth, of what we devote to our so-called defence policy, we could, I am sure, arrive at far more tangible results within quite a short time.

Here, then, is my proposal: it is based on two theories which I have taken from the actual context of this Conference. The first and more general theory is that a well-constructed European idea, the idea of an imaginative rather than a commercialised Europe, might be able to galvanise the peoples of our continent and at last bring them together in the will to creative affirmation. The second is taken from the report "Public aid for creation in the plastic arts", page 70, to which I would like to refer you.

Why not then initiate in all associated countries a vast operation of support for artistic creation centred on the European idea? Orders, prices, subsidies, various aids could be assigned to works, to projects, to programmes of all kinds, from urban animation to theoretical writings, including videograms and children's shows and, of course, the more classical types of work like paintings and musical compositions, on condition that they developed the European idea. I repeat: develop. For, it is not merely a question of illustrating an existing notion. The whole of the population with all its agents specialising in varying degrees in cultural creation must be given the means of expressing and initially of discovering its idea of a multiple European reality, past, present and future, and of presenting this as a vast composition, a kind of huge "jeux sans frontières", but much more inspiring, using all means of communication, information and especially exchanges. The governments should undertake to support this large-scale operation in an active, intelligent, substantial and really democratic way. After some time, say 3 to 5 years, a kind of pyramid competition could be organised by the Council of Europe, which could polarise the whole exercise and give it definite deadlines, without thereby depriving the products, even those without a prize, either of their value or of their specific function. And if the operation proves to be a real success, if only at first as a promise or a foretaste, it could then be taken on to a second stage of greater or lesser novelty in relation to the first.

Address by Mr Roy Shaw, Secretary General, Arts Council of Great Britain

A 19th Century English recipe for jugged hare begins with the advice: "First catch your hare". There is a similar problem in encouraging artistic creation. First catch your artist or at any rate decide who is an artist.

In the visual arts particularly there is a degree of chaos in artistic standards. Some suggest that an artist is anyone who chooses to call himself an artist. Others say that if a man has talent, good intentions, dedication, then he is an artist. I think it necessary to say a man may have all these qualities and still not be a real artist. The chaos of values in judging works of art has gone so far that the concept of quality itself is regarded in some quarters as authoritarian or undemocratic. The word equality is more popular than the word quality and the whole of our debate, I should think, ought to centre around balancing the claims of quality and equality. If we go too far in either direction we distort our true purpose.

Some of this confusion about values infects the discussion about amateurs and professionals. M. Guy is certainly right to say that the gap between amateurs and professionals must disappear, but the distinction, rather than the gap, surely must not disappear. The true professional sets the standards for amateurs to aspire to, and is also a living reminder that if amateurs are to do good work, they must strive to acquire the necessary skills and achieve higher standards.

Turning to the question of aid to artists, I would say that promising talents must be encouraged. This involves taking risks, but there must be no guarantee of a life-long pension regardless of the quality of performance. As the Minister for Norway said, we do not want to go back to the time when artists were expected to starve in garrets. But equally we do not want guaranteed subsidies for mediocrity.

A recent survey showed that in England some quite well-known artists still earn a comparatively small annual sum from their work. This is wrong, and we are increasing our grants to individual artists. Like the French we also give special grants for the acquisition and furnishing of studios.

Another source of income for visual artists is for them to become teachers. Many artists in my country have supplemented their income considerably by teaching. I do not think this is a good system. For many artists teaching is a distraction from their real work. They undertake it only because of economic necessity. Moreover, skill as an artist does not always go along with skill as a teacher.

Often artists need to be students rather than teachers. A few great artists are self-made, but many artists need help with further training. We can give financial aid for this and it is particularly helpful to facilitate foreign travel by artists since happily art does not live within the confines of national boundaries.

Apart from training artists themselves, we must train their audiences who need their susceptibilities widened, particularly to appreciate the work of living artists. School is not the only place for this work, and perhaps not even the primary place, but adult education, life-long education, should be used to help the many adults who find much modern art so mystifying.

Turning to the distribution of artists' work, we must obviously do all we can to create opportunities for their display in exhibitions. In England, the Arts Council runs two galleries in London and prepares exhibitions to tour galleries throughout the country.

But in addition to the distribution of original works, I suggest we need to encourage the production of good quality prints. I know that a print can never do justice to the original work, but it is a very good second best, and for many people it will be their only opportunity to **see** the works, and quite certainly their only opportunity to **live with** them. The cost of insuring travelling exhibitions of valuable works is very heavy and we should not under-estimate the value of prints to people who live remote from large galleries. The overwhelming majority of the people will never be able to afford a first-rate original work, but they can afford to buy a first-rate print, and perhaps we should do all we can to improve the quality of print production, as we know they vary very considerably.

I agree strongly with the Norwegian Minister that in increasing aid to artists we must do nothing to reduce their freedom. We do not want

official or state art. In Great Britain, the Arts Council exists as a buffer between government and the artist and I think it is important to have such an insulation between the authorities and the artist. I should hesitate to say, in such an assembly, that politicians cannot be trusted to run the arts, had not our own Minister for the Arts said as much himself on taking up his appointment.

In conclusion, it is always easier to subsidise institutions than individuals, always safer to do so; but we must not therefore neglect subsidies to the individual artist.

I have argued that subsidising individual artists involves a gamble – taking risks. We must take those risks but we must reduce them to the minimum by getting the best advice we can on the quality of the artist's work.

Address by Mr Michel Guy, Minister for Culture, France

I have on a previous occasion tried to define the role of creativity in contemporary society. I would now like to give you an idea of the French Government's attitude, from a technical point of view, towards creative artists in the field of plastic arts. First of all it looks at support for the arts in general from the twin angle of pluralism and the non-permanence of machinery and our efforts at present, in this field as indeed elsewhere, are designed to encourage the development of regional activities and links with other countries.

As regards the material security of artists, which is one of our main concerns, recognition of their social rights was effective in France as long ago as 1964, but with the legislation which I had the Assemblies adopt in 1975, a new step has been taken. From a social security point of view, the new legislation puts the artist more on a par with the wage-earner, in particular as regards health insurance, maternity benefits, death, temporary and permanent physical handicaps and family allowances, while at the same time the conditions for being covered on the social security have been widened. As regards the property and moral rights of the artist, French artists have enjoyed the right of succession since 1920. Reproduction rights were recognised even earlier, in principle as far back as the end of the last century, although current legislation will need to be adapted to take account of modern developments as regards the production of pictures by new or traditional methods.

Lastly as regards taxation, artists are allowed a spread of taxable profits over a three-year period as well as certain special exemptions, in particular from value added tax on the products of their art, excluding works reproduced on a large scale.

Direct state patronage takes several forms in France; first of all, the traditional types of incentives and allowances, as well as research

scholarships adapted to modern needs, in view of the discontinuation in particular of the Prix de Rome. This patronage also takes on a fairly original form in what we call "first exhibition" assistance. About a dozen such exhibitions were susidised in 1975. Another type of patronage is state purchasing policy: through committees, the French Government at present buys contemporary works of art at a cost of between twelve and fifteen million francs each year. The subsidies themselves are not directly controlled by the state, since they are in fact distributed through institutions or committees which have a power of decision. In the interests of impartiality, the membership of committees is generally changed every year.

I would now like to give you some information concerning a scheme, which is still not well enough known in Europe, and which we refer to as the "one per cent scheme". Thanks to this scheme, we have set up a kind of vast exhibition of the various trends of contemporary monumental art, and one which is open to the public in many towns and schools. I think it is worth explaining some of the details of the legislation, on which this one percent scheme has been based. The first Act goes back to 1953; it was subsequently amended several times, and again as recently as last year. In general terms, it lays down an obligation, within the estimates for every school and university construction project, to allocate one per cent of the total cost of construction, whether financed by the Ministry of Education or the State Secretariat for the universities, or by subsidies granted to local authorities responsible for the construction, for the purpose of general ornamentation. This ornamentation, which originally concerned only the plastic arts in the traditional sense of the term, has, since 1972, included architectural and landscape developments. The scheme was reviewed on the occasion of an exhibition held in Paris in 1970, when it was found that nearly all the major French and foreign artists working in France at present have taken part in this type of operation. Of course, not all the works – and there are several thousands in France at present – are of the same standard. But it should be pointed out that the decision here is not merely taken on a national level; up to a certain amount, decisions are taken on a regional level and only those involving sums exceeding 50,000 FF are taken on the national level, by a committee, as I said before.

The last point I would like to touch upon in this description of the situation in France concerning direct aid to artists is the provision of artists' workshops. I think I can say that our policy here is fairly active, since between 1965 and 1975 about 650 new workshops have been built in France.

But apart from these direct aids, I think it is reasonably clear that something must be done to disseminate works, to make them better known, to improve contacts between artists and their art and the public and to foster a spirit of mutual understanding. Besides its museums and galleries, France by tradition has always had a great number of exhibitions; in the first place there have been national exhibitions, representing extremely varied trends, including the purely academic, which are generally held in Paris. But in nearly all French towns there are also local art exhibitions, either amateur or professional, or sometimes a mixture of the two. Furthermore, we have for some years been very active in organising light mobile exhibitions, especially of lithographs.

I would now like to give you a brief description of one of the pilot schemes, which, in my opinion, is among the most interesting we have undertaken in France. It was launched three years ago and I gave it much personal support. I refer to the Centre de recherche d'animation et de création pour les arts plastiques. This Centre was initially set up in Le Creusot, and its activities have now spread over a large part of Eastern France. It does involve exhibitions, but the works exhibited are executed on the spot by painters or sculptors in full view of and among the public. In the case of sculptors, the work is done in factories, from materials prepared by workmen.

But the most important development in France this year is of course the opening of the Centre Georges Pompidou, of which you must have heard a great deal. I would merely like to say that the purpose of the Centre is to be a window for France onto the world of artistic creation, and at the same time a window for Paris onto the French provinces. The purpose initially assigned to it by President Pompidou was that of being a library, a museum, a permanent exhibition and a musical institute. But he wanted it also to be a kind of point of reference, with a world-wide projection in the field of the creative arts, such a role being indispensable if compartmentalisation in this most important sector is to be avoided, and designed to avoid mediocrity, by maintaining an exchange of information on a truly world-wide scale, of benefit both to artists and to the public. However, the French state in no way intends to monopolise support for the arts. Instead, it pays the greatest attention to the activities of private galleries and collectors. The latter are granted tax exemptions to assist the purchase of contemporary art works as well as to encourage gifts to the state, by allowing them to pay succession and transfer duties by donating works of art to state museums.

These, then, are the measures through which the government of France tries to discharge its obligations towards artists. I would like to conclude by observing that they apply both to French artists and to foreign artists residing in France. The varied origins of artists in the Ecole de Paris was a source of incomparable wealth, which we have not forgotten and from which we have drawn the appropriate lesson.

THEME IV

European Cultural Co-operation

Introductory address by Mr Gherardo Cornaggia Medici Castiglioni, Head of the Italian Delegation

Freedom and democracy: the foundation and aim of a European cultural policy

The need for European cultural co-operation is immediately apparent in the spirit as well as the letter of the statutes of the Council of Europe and of the European Cultural Convention.

These show that the culture, art and cultural policy of a country and cultural co-operation between countries can only derive from the desire for freedom and democracy whose aim is the institution of "cultural democracy". This is one of the most original concepts developed by the work of the Council of Europe and it constitutes the foundation and aim of any action aimed at progress and the promotion of democracy and culture.

It is evident that culture and art must not be constrained, manipulated or utilised as instruments of power or propaganda, even though we are not unaware of the existence of many cases of such manipulation.

However, in order to reach in all countries all the various strata of society, including particularly those which have been excluded from cultural activities, culture and art must adopt new ways and means, perhaps even a new didactical and pedagogical approach. The Council of Europe is pursuing the policy of promoting culture and art, not only by trying to extend the infrastructures which allow for better dissemination of cultural and artistic messages in complete freedom and with the greatest variety of experience and trends, but also by calling for all citizens and all different social groups to be given the opportunity of taking part in the creation of new cultural and artistic forms, to help,

for instance, in establishing an "aesthetic" dimension to life, to improve the quality of life.

The scope of European cultural co-operation

A policy of European cultural co-operation is needed in response to the following fundamental requirements:

- an exchange of experience between European countries with their various national cultural policies;
- the creation of common forms, structures and strategies to achieve a cultural policy on the national and European level favouring cultural relations between countries;
- the creation of a European cultural community, of a "European cultural democracy", founded on a more extensive participation by the public and the various social strata.

In other words what is needed is a European **cultural strategy** to reaffirm the deeply rooted cultural foundation common to all European countries; to study infrastructures for channelling national and community cultural messages according to a common European perspective; to respect and enhance the characteristics and differences which make the European cultural landscape so rich and so varied; to encourage culture and art to become a driving force in European social and economic policy as a whole.

Past experience

In the space of almost thirty years, the action of the Council of Europe has led to remarkable results with regard to cultural democracy and the affirmation of educational and cultural programmes to achieve it.

One need only recall some of the more characteristic initiatives:

- the experiments and programmes in the field of permanent education, with all their implications;
- European architectural heritage year, which drew attention to and enhanced a fundamental aspect of European civilisation, namely the identification, recuperation and protection of a language of architecture and town planning common to the whole of Europe, with its innumerable differences and characteristics;
- the European exhibitions, the next of which is to be held in Berlin.

One could mention many more fruitful examples of European co-operation attributable to the action of the CCC, but it is also fair to

observe, for the sake of honest criticism, that some of the initiatives sponsored by the Council of Europe or by the CCC have not always led to the desired results. This is due to many reasons and these are being studied at the moment. To put it briefly, it has been mainly due to the dispersion of resources, to an excess of projects, however interesting and valid they may be: in some countries it has been due to a lack of effect on programmes and on national administrative and cultural structures, to the weak impact on the Council of Europe on public opinion and on society and to inadequate information channels.

One must have the courage to admit shortcomings, and I think the Minister for Ireland was right to draw attention to some of these.

The main lines of European cultural strategy in the coming years

A long-term and far-reaching action will need to be undertaken in the coming years. It will have to be carefully prepared, be as little bureaucratic as possible, though well-organised; it must be closely linked to public administrations and local authorities and must seek the support of public opinion in general, and of cultural, professional and trade unions organisations. There must be an effort to see that national programmes of cultural promotion, dissemination, and participation should have a common spirit in spite of their differences.

A larger share of the Council of Europe and the CCC's budget should therefore be devoted to out-of-school education and cultural advancement, which are the twin pillars of the whole system of cultural co-operation.

The foundation and main aim of this action must today more than ever be the re-affirmation and the promotion of the principles of freedom and democracy.

Here are some of the objectives which could be achieved in the long term by means of an overall strategy of cultural co-operation:

- a bold and broad advance of permanent education and out-of-school education;
- new forms of education, which are now being tried out in many places, must be more clearly defined with the participation of young people and adults, or workmen and farm workers.

These new forms of out-of-school education require new educational instruments or the adaptation of existing ones such as museums, which should increasingly become centres of training for the visual arts, and for the history of past and present forms; or

libraries, which are centres of cultural advancement systems of public reading complete with all the new media;

- towns, whether large or small, with their architecture and their town planning, should be considered as one of the main elements for the promotion of culture, artistic sensibility and democracy. As such, they must be preserved and their oldest parts must be improved. Their modern expansion should be carefully controlled and planned with the help of all the citizens, who must be called upon to take part increasingly in the planning and management of their towns. At the same time both old and moderns quarters must be equipped with an effective network of cultural amenities;
- the countryside has always been a cradle of European culture; still today it represents a rich reserve of neglected or secondary cultures, of a rural culture which is fast tending to disappear. The countryside must be protected against excessive industrial growth; protected areas, large or small nature parts must be instituted; agricultural production and genuine manual trades – which are closely linked – must be encouraged;
- museums must not be mere scientific institutions, but must become real educational instruments, instruments which can contribute to the visual arts, to forms in general, to forms of industrial life (design), of urban life ("aesthetic" urbanism, "aesthetic" dimension of the town), of the country as a whole;
- libary systems must be set up to act as centres for the promotion of culture;
- the theatre and other spectacles should serve not only to preserve the traditional repertory, but to encourage spontaneous and non-professional activities;
- cinema and television, beside their cultural role, are powerful instruments of information and means of education, as was so well pointed out by the Finnish Minister. Care must be taken, however, to see that they are not conditioned by the culture industry and in particular by censorship;
- music is an excellent educational instrument in all its forms: listening and participation;
- handicrafts (do-it-yourself work), participation in works of plastic art, and in the improvement and maintenance of the immediate environment and of the countryside are to be encouraged.

These items will give some indication of a few of the objectives which can be achieved by joint long-term European cultural action.

The policy of cultural co-operation will only really be achieved, will only have a truly European character and be favourably received by our people, and will only contribute to the construction of Europe **to the extent** that it succeeds in emerging from vagueness, good intentions, and the bureaucratic morass, from the dispersion of too many projects. It requires a common body to supervise its adoption; swift and continuous action, not hamstringed by bureaucratic procedures; adequate funds; a suitable impact on national administrations; the ability and the will to inform and influence public opinion. The time is approaching when the European parliament will be directly elected: when that time comes, there should already be in existence a European cultural community to serve as a basis and a stimulus for the political community.

But the opportunity we are given here to reflect **about future** cultural co-operation between the signatories of the European Cultural Convention should enable us here and now to initiate a more concrete process.

Much criticism can be directed, and quite rightly, at European cultural policy. It is particularly necessary to continue our self-criticism.

As far as we are concerned, we have no miracle remedies to put forward. In our opinion, it is essentially a question of improving the existing instrument of European cultural co-operation. In this respect it is worth remembering the importance of the task pursued by the Council for Cultural Co-operation, the CCC, for the last few sessions, namely to rationalise, plan and seriously asses its action and the results achieved. The first conclusions of this effort have now appeared in the form of the chapters on "Education and Culture" of the Medium-Term Plan of the Council of Europe, which our Conference **must** – within its terms of reference, that is, as regards the chapter on "Culture" – **recognise** as valid, and whose importance it must stress as a basis for future action in the field of European cultural co-operation in the framework of the European Cultural Convention.

There are other results in preparation, which were discussed at the last session of the CCC. It is therefore essential that our Conference should give all necessary support to the great plan for renewal which the only organisation existing under the European Cultural Convention, the CCC, is putting into effect. Our governments have several means of supporting this task, moral and political means but also material means.

There is no doubt that a renewed, restructured and stronger CCC, equipped with a rigorous and rigorously assessed programme could

become, **providing there is the political will**, the spearhead of our multilateral European cultural action.

One of the results or our Conference – and not the least – could therefore be to select ways and means of ensuring at all levels a more effective commitment of our Ministers of Culture in support of the renovation and reinforcement of the CCC.

If the cultural co-operation of our 22 countries should become more effective thanks to our joint effort in the framework of the European Cultural Convention which is an **open** and **dynamic** instrument, it is not hard to predict – and this is the wish we would like to express – that this could lead to future possibilities of great interest not only on the widest European level but above all in the perspective of the cultural role of Europe in relation to and in interaction with all the cultures of the other regions of the world.

Address by Mr H. F. Van Aal, Minister for French Culture, Belgium

Looking at the period 1960-1976, one can speak of the joint creation of a doctrine which starts from a policy for leisure activities, develops the principles of permanent education, considers that there can be no permanent education without cultural development, no cultural development without socio-cultural animation, asserts that permanent education and cultural development are two aspects of one and the same process and finally – and this is the crux of the matter – declares that any cultural policy must be based on participation and hence on cultural democracy.

This common European philosophy, these ideas more or less theoretically accepted in all our countries, have often entered into and influenced national decisions by adjusting to specific situations, available structures and credits. In this spirit, several countries have changed their legislation. That we are now meeting in Oslo and that the Swedish Minister is dealing with the theme of the cultural challenge, is because these two countries are resolutely committed to an overall review of their legislation in the cultural field.

We feel that this first meeting of Ministers of Culture cannot close without re-defining the principles which, in the course of the next few years, must guide those responsible for our European cultural co-operation within the system of the Council of Europe.

1. The basis of this co-operation is the Cultural Convention. This Convention has been open and receptive and must remain so.

2. The Convention must continue to be implemented by a single steering body to ensure the coherence and complementarity of school and out-of-school policies, permanent education, culture, sport and research in all these fields.

3. This steering body is autonomous in the drafting, planning and implementation of programmes; all states signatory to the Convention participate on a fully equal basis.

4. The Cultural Fund provides flexibility of financing and a channel for voluntary contributions.

5. Cultural co-operation goes far beyond the work of preparing theoretical resolutions and recommendations and evolves its own theory for the initiation of direct actions, some experimental, others permanent – witness this conference.

6. The participation of the Parliamentary Assembly as a member of the CCC in its own right is permanently guaranteed.

So much for basic principles.

We should not, however, try to hide the shortcomings of our cultural co-operation; I believe these arise mainly from the fact that this co-operation has taken the form almost exclusively of discussions among experts, of technical or technocratic comparisons, and has lacked a joint approach of a more political kind to guide its choice of priorities. It is paradoxical that this entire development should have taken place over so long a period without the ministers responsible ever being personally involved.

The legal framework of European co-operation within the Council of Europe system gives too little place to the national ministers concerned and leaves cultural co-operation to be carried out through traditional diplomatic channels. I would personally not hesitate to assert that the evolution of European thinking and of structures for building a united Europe in the course of the last 25 years implies the direct responsibility of specialised ministers for cultural co-operation on a European level. International co-operation is a normal feature of our political responsibility; it must be conducted in close consultation between ministers in charge of cultural affairs; it must precede confirmations arising from international instruments negotiated on a diplomatic level in accordance with agreed practice. There can be no progressive cultural co-operation without going beyond the formulation of resolutions and recommendations prior to common experimentation and concrete exchanges.

Several years ago the Ministers of Education established the practice of the "ad hoc conference" designed to lay down the main guidelines for the CCC's work in education. After Oslo, we shall have an equivalent instrument in the cultural field. The choices made at this conference will leave their impression on the activity of the coming months.

It is now a matter of strengthening the links between the Conference of Ministers of Education, the Conference of Ministers of

Culture and the CCC, which is to become the common permanent executive body.

We know that the present machinery for co-operation in the Council of Europe system **does not** provide for this organic **link** with the CCC. These conferences have so far been only "ad hoc" meetings. The specialised ministers, through coherent attitudes on domestic policy and their links with the foreign ministers, must see to it that the **de facto** political authority of these conferences should assert itself in order to give the Cultural Convention and the Council for Cultural Co-operation, which is responsible for programming their full operational and also fundamentally political status.

In conclusion, I have no hesitation in putting forward here the idea that the CCC should meet once a year at ministerial level: the experts would thus have the benefit of precise political guidance and the work of the CCC would accordingly have a regular impact on national policies.

Address by Mr Robert Krieps, Minister of Cultural Affairs, Luxembourg

Mr Chairman, Gentlemen

I should like to say a few words as representative of the country at present presiding over the Council of Ministers of the European Communities. As you know, the Commission has launched some initiatives and is preparing to take practical steps to encourage the free movement of goods and services in the cultural field. The aim of the Commission is not ambitious; it is not to devise a common cultural policy for the "Nine" but initially to eliminate obstacles and later to create conditions favourable to free movement. It is of course obvious that the notion of free movement is linked to that of dissemination, and hence to increasing demand or in any event the free development of demand. This action by the Community, however modest, may therefore be seen as a form of genuine co-operation.

A number of you were present at the Obernai Conference as Ministers of Education and will remember the reproach made to the "Nine" and to the Commission for encroaching in some way on the prerogatives of the Council of Europe and in particular of the Council for Cultural Co-operation.

I feel I can and should lay such fears to rest, since they are not justified, if only because there is still so much to do in Europe that the multiplicity of points of contact is unlikely to constitute a matter of concern, even at the cost of some temporary and accidental overlapping. Furthermore, I sincerely believe it would be dangerous if economic and social affairs caused such a division in the Europe of the "Nine" that it would be hard to bridge in the cultural field or in other fields such as the political. It would be equally dangerous and absurd in my view to think that the "Nine" which belong to the European Communities take less interest than other countries in the cultural activities of the Council of Europe; the same criticism could apply just as well to the Scandinavian countries, which although bound by the Nordic Cultural Agreement are no less interested on that account in the work of the Council for Cultural Co-operation. I would

even go so far as to say that, quite on the contrary, there is a tendency for interest and action to be increased by commitment on different levels and in different spheres. I think that, as far as the "Nine" are concerned, we shall soon see that the fact of entering an operational phase – the guidelines of which were recently drawn up by the Commission and approved by the European Parliament – will undoubtedly give new vigour to community action in this sector. These practical measures will be a concrete application in the daily life of community citizens of the principles for the establishment of which we owe so much to the Council of Europe.

I feel I can also give an assurance that there will be no separatism, either open or concealed, on the part of the "Nine" in relation to the "Twenty-two".

This is why I would like to add my support to the proposals which have just been made, and which are now, as it were, springing up on all sides, regarding cultural co-operation, and particularly the excellent idea put forward by Mr Van Aal for a meeting at the level of CCC ministers, which could facilitate this regular meeting without any need to alter the legal and diplomatic instruments of our co-operation. I also think that, as has been pointed out by Mr Michel Guy in connection in particular with Items 3, 4 and 5 of these proposals, individual measures will be more worthwhile and will help to stress the practical aspect of our action.

In any case, I feel personally that European cultural policy is too important a matter to be left to professional diplomats, who are pursuing several objectives at once and sometimes sacrifice culture for political motives, or politics for social motives and vice-versa, the adjectives being interchangeable in this respect. So I feel we must make it our concern, if only in a spirit of clear-sighted self-interest, because in our respective countries, as Mr Michel Guy has just pointed out, we have to cope with increasingly close scrutiny in financial quarters, and as our resources are rapidly shrinking we shall in this respect be facing the same problem in all our countries. I therefore believe that this self-interest, which could lead us to intensify our co-operation, will help us in our respective countries to overcome our problems, whilst providing us with measures and instruments which are no longer alibis but real political justifications with which to confront our domestic opponents. I therefore feel that at present, quite apart from what I have just said about the Community, the proposals made by previous orators certainly deserve to be followed up, particularly within the framework of the Committee which is dealing with this matter. But I would straightaway like to subscribe to the principles and inspiring ideas which have just been put forward.

Address by Mr R. Grégoire, Observer of the Commission of the European Communities

I shall be content for a moment to follow in the path opened by Minister Krieps. I would like to bring out what is perhaps not clearly enough shown in the report of the European Communities, that the actions to which the Commission has given priority and whose general guidelines were approved on 8 March of this year by all countries and all parties represented in the European Parliament, do not constitute a form of duplication.

They do not duplicate the work of UNESCO.

Nor do they duplicate the work done in individual countries. As regards the Community, we never mention cultural policy or cultural affairs.

Finally they do not duplicate the work of the Council of Europe.

The studies we initiate (and which are only part of our activities, i.e. the preparatory part) are simply factual situation studies, that is, photographs which are as accurate a replica as possible of unsatisfactory situations which we believe we can change. These studies are therefore in line with the thoughts expressed by Minister Michel Guy as regards social security, taxation, copyright royalties, the protection of property in artistic professions, manual trades etc. On the other hand, the Council of Europe has the great merit of undertaking what I might call fundamental research.

We accept the various concepts which have been elaborated by the Council of Europe in its work, e.g. cultural development, cultural democracy, socio-cultural leadership, integrated conservation etc.

We benefit from the achievements of the Council of Europe. We make these achievements our starting point.

In Brussels we speak of community action in the cultural sector.

Even though for our part we have made no attempt to define culture, we have tried to define the cultural sector. According to our definition, the cultural sector comprises all the organisations and individuals engaged in the production and distribution of cultural goods and services.

But organisations and individuals, production and distribution and goods and services go together with economic and social problems.

The Commission wants the Community to try to find solutions to some of the economic problems and some of the social problems of the cultural sector and to find solutions to these problems by the means specifically provided by the Treaty by which it was instituted. These means are essentially legal and entail the enactment of certain community instruments, through which practical measures are introduced in all the member countries. If I may use a word which might appear a little out of place on such an occasion, I would say we only seek to provide better "logistic" for culture. In this way the Community will remain within its terms of reference, within the field of its own experience. We feel this should be a way of producing results.

Outside the strict application of the Treaty, I could name a few projects. This I shall not do, so as not to take up too much of your time. In any event you would realise that firstly these projects are quite modest and secondly they entail no risk of duplication.

What exactly does community action in the cultural sector consist of? It forms a whole, if not complete, at least broad and varied – and undoubtedly coherent.

We hope this action will be a contribution as far as the Council of Europe is concerned – in exchange for the latter's own contribution, which is invaluable – a contribution from the Nine to the thirteen other member countries of the European Cultural Convention.

We would like to see a pragmatic and operational approach to European cultural co-operation. We wish to co-operate whenever this is possible and useful.

I would agree with the head of the Italian delegation: we shall co-operate taking care to avoid all bureaucratic perfectionism. Such perfectionism, indeed, only leads to paralysis. And there is so much to be done! By all countries, and all international organisations, which are not ends in themselves but there to serve the member countries and mankind. In the face of real needs and urgent requirements, to indulge in disputes on questions of jurisdiction would be a fatal error.

Address by Mr Necip Inceler, Director of External Relations, Ministry of Culture, Turkey

We are deeply interested in what the Council for Cultural Co-operation has done for cultural co-operation, within the framework of the European Cultural Convention. In its Medium-Term Plan, the CCC has determined for the last two years all cultural activities concerning the member countries in the cultural section of the said plan.

At the present time we consider that the Cultural Fund assigned to the Council for Cultural Co-operation cannot be enough to finance the projects of this cultural plan. We believe that the success of the Medium-Term Plan depends on an increase in the Cultural Fund.

We believe that co-operation amongst the members of the Council of Europe can be improved by recognising each other's cultures. Accordingly, we appreciate the activities of European Architectural Heritage Year, although this was just one important aspect of culture. We hope that these mutual exhibitions will continue. Further cultural activity in other important branches of culture, permitting scope for particular considerations and necessities, will also be very interesting and beneficial.

We also think it advantageous to make known the cultural activities of the Council of Europe to the younger generation. Therefore we also support the idea of a project on "Children and Culture", proposed by the Danish Government.

We encourage the Council of Europe to undertake intensive study and research into the cultural needs of the European people – especially on integration into their national culture – we also hope that it may be able to research possible methods with useful results. One of the major topics for governments is the situation of the "Creators of Culture" or "Men of Arts" – i.e. their problems and needs, and the resolution of these, throughout Europe.

We believe that European cultural co-operation may be effective if the Council of Cultural Co-operation adopts a dynamic approach to its work. Here also, I would draw the attention of the Council to the fact that cultural development is related – to a large extent – to the economic development of a country. I think that, while recognising the priorities of the Council for Cultural Co-operation, it would be advantageous to bear in mind the whole range of possibilities for development of the member countries; economic, technical, scientific, social and cultural.

In conclusion, the Council for Cultural Co-operation, while continuing its task of exchanging ideas based on the results of research should, we consider, also be an organ offering concrete and practical assistance to the governments. This institution should introduce and diffuse its activities widely throughout the European countries. Although its activities are largely in the fields of education, culture and youth, mutual recognition of other cultures would be made more effective by the publication, in the languages of the member countries, of works showing the cultural characteristics of each country.

Adress by Mr B. Zachrisson, Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs, Sweden

Within some of the frameworks for intergovernmental cultural co-operation, Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs are given the possibility to lay down the political priorities for co-operation in their fields. As for the co-operation within the Council of Europe, there are no such direct channels for Ministers of Culture to influence the work programme.

It seems to me a matter of course that Ministers who are politically responsible at home should also exert decisive influence on the choice of priorities on the international scene.

How this should be achieved for the future could be a matter for the organisation in question to consider. It is evident, however, that this ad hoc conference should not remain an isolated event. One of the most important aspects of these meetings of Ministers, as I see it, is perhaps the possibility they offer to Ministers of direct and personal contacts outside the bureaucratic machinery. It is possible that more attention to this aspect should be paid if and when conferences of this kind are being organised in the future.

Our international co-operation should be of a pragmatic nature, and should aim at offering member governments a wide range of solutions to the problems of improving national cultural conditions and educational systems.

As a step in this process the member countries should be prepared to accept a clearing house for reforms and experiments going on in Europe.

One concrete example of what I am aiming at is the excellent survey commissioned by the Council for Cultural Co-operation for this conference, "The Demystification of Culture" written by Finn Jor. This

book is a valuable source of information and inspiration for all those who are engaged in the work of socio-cultural development at various levels.

The point of departure of our cultural co-operation should be the broadened concept of culture, that is culture as **both** a means for individual self-fulfillment **and** a vehicle for the overriding political goals of democracy and equality.

My government, for its part, **cannot** accept the narrow cultural concept, i.e. based on the fine arts for either our national cultural politics or our European co-operation in the cultural field. The aim of our co-operation must necessarily be to try and find solutions to the problem of **how** to meet the cultural needs of our people as a whole, according to the overriding principles for social development.

One of the goals of cultural policy in my country is to promote an exchange of experience and ideas across geographic and linguistic borders. The vitality of national cultural life presupposes a receptivity to other cultures than our own. Also, the large number of immigrants in our country has made cultural contacts with other countries even more important.

The large cultural institutions have long had an established network for international contacts and exchanges. We think that it is important to broaden these international contacts so as to include both amateur activities and popular movements, and to extend our cultural contacts to other countries where previously contact has been less developed.

Another question that I feel could be studied in our future co-operation is the co-ordination of cultural policy with other social policies, in order to arrive at a comprehensive view on man and his needs. As we have said earlier in this conference, culture cannot be isolated from other sectors of social responsibility. Ways of including culturally and socially disadvantaged groups in cultural activities could also be studied and discussed within the CCC, as well as measures to support and develop immigrant cultures as a valuable asset to national culture.

Even though UNESCO obviously is the most appropriate forum for an all-European cultural co-operation, as well as for co-operation with developing countries, I believe that a great deal could be achieved by an exchange of views between the Cultural Convention countries on means and methods to be adopted at national level if we are to comply with the goals set forth in the Final Act of the Conference

on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and possibly also on means and methods to develop bilateral cultural exchange with developing countries. I am also confinced that the circle of countries present here all have something to gain from opening the doors for cultural contact towards the east.

The frequently expressed wish to introduce a new international economic order is a challenge to us to reappraise our present ways of life, and to broaden our cultural co-operation with developing countries.

After all, the work performed within the different frameworks for international and intergovernmental co-operation should complement each other and contribute not primarily to a regionalisation but to a true internationalisation based on solidarity and friendship between all peoples.

117

Address by Mr Kalevi Kivistö, Minister of Education with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, Finland

On behalf of Finland I would like to emphasise that the European Cultural Convention provides the legal basis for European cultural co-operation. We consider this of primary importance. The convention is and must be the real basis, and it gives the mandates for our co-operation where all the countries signatory to the convention co-operate on an equal footing. Since Finland ratified the convention and joined in the cultural and educational co-operation within the CCC in 1970, we have found this co-operation beneficial for us. The Cultural Fund and one single body for the application of the convention and the management of the Fund are, in our opinion, very vital elements. The Fund allows for flexibility in financing our cultural and educational co-operation. The convention presupposes an instrument for its application, and the existing body of the Council for Cultural Co-operation, in our opinion, meets the specific needs of states signatory to the convention. The autonomy of this single body, the CCC, is the precondition of our participation in this co-operation.

As to priority areas in this co-operation we would like to stress once more the importance of co-operation in improving the migrant workers' cultural activities and their links with their national cultures; in improvement of children's culture and in the elimination of defects of mass culture.

Address by Mr C. Hummel, Chairman of the Council for Cultural Co-operation

I am extremely grateful for the opportunity given to the Chairman of the Council for Cultural Co-operation to say a few words. I shall be extremely brief, because fortunately much of what I would have liked to say in the name of the CCC, which has instructed me to play an active role here, has already been said by the Ministers, which is much more significant than if I had said it myself, as Chairman of the CCC.

Many speakers have stressed the importance of the Cultural Convention. It is in fact the legal basis of our co-operation here and has furthermore provided the framework for this Conference, since it is thanks to the existence of this Convention and thanks to the fact that it has been ratified by your governments that there are 22 Ministers around this table and not only 18, as is the case in the Council of Europe. The CCC is responsible for implementing this Convention, and is therefore perhaps the most important instrument at your disposal for implementing cultural policy in Europe. There are of course other instruments which are very important, such as UNESCO, which brought you together 4 years ago in Helsinki to discuss within the broad framework of the whole of Europe the same subjects which concern us here today. I do not know if I am going too far in saying that the CCC, which is responsible for implementing the Cultural Convention, is one of the reasons why you are gathered here, that if this instrument did not exist, the conference might never have taken place. I also hope that it is true to say that its contribution in terms of matter for thought and discussion, prepared in the CCC, will have proved useful. The CCC, as an instrument of co-operation between the 22 is a place in which to exchange ideas and information; but it is more than that: it is also a laboratory of ideas, where new concepts for cultural action are worked out in common. The CCC regularly brings together your Senior Officials around the same table, thus creating important bonds of

co-operation and friendship. It has also created a whole network on which a great part of our European co-operation is now based. The CCC not only brings together the Senior Officials: each year it brings into contact hundreds of experts in education and culture, thus creating a vital network for European cultural co-operation.

The CCC has recently been criticised – today, even its specific character is threatened. It is threatened by proposals for replanning all the structures of the Council of Europe, without taking account of the specific character of the CCC. This consists first of all in the extremely close relationship between the educational work and the cultural work carried out in the CCC, and secondly in the presence within it of the Parliamentary Assembly – an extremely important presence, since it voices the opinions of not only government departments but also our countries and our peoples. Thus, it is an important means for the dissemination of the ideas worked out within the CCC. And the complexity and fragility of any cultural programme or policy requires great care when interfering with its foundations.

The CCC has been criticised in a different way, inconsistently, and from the outside. It has also been criticised from inside. I am pleased to note that many of you have particularly emphasised the constructive activities of the CCC. But we are aware of its shortcomings and have therefore started a process of reviewing our acivities. We have initiated a systematic process of evaluating and planning working methods and structures, which should lead to a renewal of the CCC as an instrument of European cultural co-operation. I shall do all within my power to see that this action of renewal leads to really positive results.

But all we can undertake are technical projects – we improve planning, assessment, reflection, we can draw up better programmes. But this is not quite the heart of the matter. What we need, and what cultural co-operation needs to become really effective, is your political will, since that is the only factor which can lead us further, which can take us beyond technical projects. To implement a common cultural policy in Europe, this political will must be clearly expressed, so that the CCC may fulfil your requirements and help to create a more united Europe.

Expression of this political will is thus most important. You and your governments must also provide the institution with the necessary means for implementing your political will; and these means are of three kinds: firstly the intellectual contribution which you are prepared to make by taking part yourselves perhaps in the CCC's deliberations

or by sending your best and most authoritative officials. Secondly, if you wish to have a really effective institution, you and your government must place at its disposal sufficient staff both in number and in quality. And, finally, the CCC needs adequate material and financial resources, which it has not go at present. Therefore, the CCC needs you to deal with it yourself, to provide it with its basic guidelines. In this respect some very concrete proposals have been put forward and I will make no secret of the fact that they are entirely in line with my own views. I hope that these new ideas, these guidelines which you will give to the new CCC, will include a broader outlook on the future as well as a broader outlook on the world, since in the present world situation, as the Swedish Minister has just mentioned, we need to increase exchanges between us Europeans and other parts of the world.

FINAL SESSION

Address on Theme I by Lord Donaldson, Minister for the Arts, United Kingdom

Our discussions have thrown a light on the nature of the challenge to our cultural policies.

We have allowed ourselves to be almost over-run by social change: we have found it hard to communicate across the generations, whether with the young or with the old. We have been far less effective than we had hoped in removing the obstacles arising from differences in educational and social backgrounds. We have seen old traditions and beliefs disappear, to be replaced only too often by beliefs even more superficial than those in which we rejoiced. We have taught our children to think for themselves and they repay us by disagreeing with us and dismissing our conventions and our traditions, but this is compensated by the much more general cultural education which they now receive. We have, in diverse ways, neglected the cultural environment until its repair has become a major charge on our resources.

The leisure that the new economic conditions have provided has been exposed to the pressures and enticements of the mass-media: public policies for culture have too often finished up second best. This is often no bad thing: in the end everything put out for popular consumption has to stand the test of the consumer. The position is not unhopeful: we are coming to see the aesthetic limitations of a purely materialistic pursuit of wealth. The striking success of the Open University has demonstrated in the United Kingdom the large number of those who demand a second chance in education. The strenght of movements for improving or safeguarding the environment – including the "cultural environment" in the conventional sense – offer much encouragement.

So we need not be pessimistic in considering the nature of the responses which should be made to the challenges I have enumerated. In the draft resolutions which are tabled the proposals are set out in

considerable detail. I wish simply to indicate the main lines which they take.

First, our policies must be based on a renewed acceptance and endorsement of the worth of the individual, be he advantaged or disadvantaged, minority or majority, native or immigrant. What he may do may not have artistic value for others. But its value for him in attaining self-expression and in integrating him into society may well be great. The policies must be comprehensive: they must recognise both of the tasks to which I earlier referred – the preservation and presentation of our existing heritage and the involvement of the community. I am not so ill-advised as to believe that we can, or should involve everyone. The conscript is a liability in cultural policy. But if we could even double the involvement we will have achieved much. These are all tasks which should be integrated: they are not, as too often portrayed, in conflict. We must refurbish our techniques and our resources to achieve this. The resources need not be large. The simple policy of paying for the custodians of schools to keep the buildings open for community activities out of school hours has been shown to pay very high cultural dividends. We must escape from prejudice in assessing new and popular art forms – but equally we must find out how to assess them and support them effectively (but here I am trespassing, all too willingly, on other themes). We must increasingly come to terms with the mass-media on cultural issues, so as to benefit fully from their facilities without the harm that otherwise might follow. Above all, we must recognise that cultural policies are not inward-looking, concerning only established art-forms. They must permeate and enrich government policies as a whole.

Acting as intermediary, I have pleasure in presenting the draft resolution [1] emerging from our committee's discussion on Theme I. I must not be thought necessarily to agree with all the resolution, but it is for the Conference to pronounce on them.

---

1. Adopted as Resolution No. 1.

Address on Theme II by Mr Kalevi Kivistö, Minister of Education responsible for Cultural Affairs, Finland

I would like to start by commenting a little on the problems of cultural policy in town and country communities. When the aims of cultural policy are to be set at the local level, we should start from the overall cultural policy objectives deriving from social policy. Such aims will be valid both in towns and country communes, irrespective of their size, location and level of economic and structural development.

In my opinion, the fundamental objective of social policy is to ensure the mental and physical well-being, freedom, security and comfort of the members of society as well as their versatile development, in accordance with the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is a socially focal objective that intellectual and material privileges are distributed in a more even and just manner, and that the members of society are offered increased opportunities to participate and exert influence democratically and that the prerequisites of utilising these possibilties are improved.

In my opinion, the general objective of cultural policy at the local level is **firstly** to secure, increase and diversify cultural services by aiming at the education, economic and social equality of all inhabitants of the municipality; **secondly** to create intellectual and material preconditions for the individual's participation in creative activities; **thirdly**, to provide artists with the prerequisites of practising their profession and thus increase and improve the cultural supply; **fourthly** to develop and activate local cultural traditions as part of the entire field of national culture, and **fifthly** to make the results of international cultural exchange available to the inhabitants at the local level.

These overall aims are essentially linked with the idea of increasing the active participation of people living in the municipalities. When

outlining more advanced programme plans, we should thus take into consideration the significance of these aims as a factor balancing the effect of commercial supranational mass culture which tends to make people passive and alienate them both socially and intellectually. The goal is to acquire a positive attitude towards cultural activities and to satisfy the cultural needs created in this way. Municipalities must strive to implement a cultural policy sufficiently pluralistic as to provide their inhabitants with the conditions necessary for carrying out cultural activities, equitably based on different ideological views of the world. In preparing special cultural policy programmes at the local level, consideration should be given not only to the factors mentioned above, but also to the size and location of the municipality, the social and linguistic structure of the population and the general level of development in the municipality.

Aims concerning the contents of cultural policy are derived from these overall cultural policy objectives which are valid at the local level. These can generally be divided into three categories:

1. **Aims promoting social orientation**

Cultural policy should be a way of eliminating and alleviating the harmful effects of social inequalities. Special attention should be given to factors related to migratory movements in the country. Towns and urban districts with a heavy influx of migration usually receive people from areas with lower economic, social and educational circumstances. The newcomers are generally incapable of cultural activity in their new environment and therefore have great difficulties in adjusting themselves to the new living and working surroundings. Local cultural policy planning and measures can contribute to the elimination of these defects. Even in big cities, internal migratory movements cause similar problems. The present systems of industrially managed area construction creates new housing areas in which cultural services badly lag behind or are even totally nonexistent. Cultural policy should further aim at removing and diminishing social alienation and intellectual stagnation caused by the cultural poverty of the living and working environment, as well as by everyday economic and social worries.

2. **Aims increasing social participation**

By increasing the possibilities of cultural participation and by improving the material prerequisites of cultural work, we can activate people to participate in social matters in general. This implies, however, that the inhabitants of the municipality have increased opportunities to influence society's cultural policy, planning, initiatives,

decision-making and implementation. By increasing the decentralisation of decision-making concerning cultural policy, and by emphasising the position and significance of cultural activities of the voluntary organisations, it is possible to improve people's active involvement and creative participation in the municipal administration of culture.

3. **Aims developing the individual's personality**

Democratic cultural policy gives people prerequisites for understanding the surrounding realities. In this way people may continue their development as intellectually active, and really democratically orientated citizens irrespective of their educational, economic or social background.

I would like to present the report of the committee for Theme II and the two draft resolutions concerning it.

The first draft resolution [1] is fairly general in nature. It covers, in my opinion, the majority of problems relevant to cultural policy at local level. At the beginning of the resolution there are some general observations concerning the background of the subject. Personally, I would like to stress the importance of the paragraph which emphasises the great number of opportunities for effective and democratic cultural policy at local level, in towns and rural municipalities. In my opinion, cultural policy and all measures taken in this field should be brought as close to the ordinary citizens as possible. Small towns and municipalities should have the opportunity to decide on their own cultural activities as well. I think that this point has been clearly expressed in the draft resolution. The concrete recommendations in this resolution call for local authorities to be provided with the necessary instruments, premises, manpower and so on, to act in accordance with this important principle.

I am delighted that the second draft resolution [1] deals with culture and the child. The significance of this question has also been widely accepted in the framework of international cultural co-operation. As this question covers, and is relevant to all sectors of cultural policy, at governmental, regional and local level as well as in international cultural co-operation, I think it appropriate that it has been presented in a resolution of its own. By adopting this resolution we in this Conference can strongly and firmly emphasise the importance of the child as an element which must be given the highest priority in the forming and implementation of cultural policy in our countries.

---

1. Adopted as Resolution No. 2.
1. Adopted as Resolution No. 3.

Address by Dr. K. Moersch on Theme III, Minister of State Federal Republic of Germany

For those responsible for the planning and implementation of cultural policy, questions of support for, and encouragement of, artistic work have for a long time been the subject of discussions and deliberations. At the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Europe, organised by UNESCO in 1972 in Helsinki, these questions also played a significant role. The foundation for all these activities and efforts is a stock of basic convictions which, I believe, are today common ground.

I would summarise these as follows:

1. Art and culture are neither a means of ostentation, nor are they dispensable luxuries.
2. If the individual is to reach his full potential, he requires not only economic, social and legal security, but also the opportunity to participate fully in artistic and cultural life in all its forms, also in the sense of cultural education. Furthermore, conditions must be created which enable the individual to recognise and apply his creative talents.
3. The artist and his work are, both in terms of the individual and of the future cultural development of society as a whole, of immense significance.
4. Due account should therefore be taken of the professional and social needs of the artist.

Another point: in recognition of this basic philosophy, a number of very positive steps have been taken in recent years by the member states of the Council of Europe. Solutions, or at least approaches to a solution, have been found for a number of problems. Problems which have not yet been solved have at least been defined in more precise terms. Our efforts until now have, however, also made it clear that, in view of the diversity and complexity of the problems facing us, we

have no reason for complacency about the results we have achieved so far in the question of support for and encouragement of artistic work.

It has also become apparent that the questions and problems associated with fostering artistic creations cannot indeed be solved all at once, as it were, by a single stroke. I would emphasise therefore, that only a whole series of purposeful individual steps, however small each single one may appear, will lead us in the end to our goal.

This all serves to highlight the importance of the third theme on our agenda. The complexity of the problems concerning the status of the artist in society did not make our deliberations in the working group any easier. Nevertheless, the work of the working group has contributed a great deal to the further clarification of the problem.

For example, some delegations felt that the question of the criteria for allocating public funds to artists was fundamental in the modern, achievement-oriented society. The crux of the issue was whether the criteria of quality and achievement were, as in other liberal professions, indispensable in the world of art. A number of delegations considered, without overlooking the problems involved, that they were indeed indispensable, and that this ultimately was in the interest of the artist as well.

Other delegations pointed out that artists who experimented or worked in areas or with forms which had not yet received general recognition, should not be excluded from public assistance. One speaker pointed out that when public funds were provided for research, immediate results were not demanded, and the risk of failure accepted.

The view was also expressed that the most important question was to use the specific talents of the artist to greater advantage, and in as many sectors of society as possible. The funds provided by society to promote and utilise artistic creativity should be correspondingly increased.

The committee emphasised the valuable role played by independent institutions, whose policies were shaped with the help of the artists themselves, in fostering artistic creation.

I should like to outline the main elements of the draft resolutions[1] on the course and direction of future work arising from discussions on Theme III.

---

1. Adopted as Resolution Nos. 4 and 5.

1. The aims of cultural policy should be as follows:
   - to make better use of the creative potential of the artist which hitherto has been utilised only in a relatively limited area;
   - to review and improve the system of remuneration for artists;
   - as far as possible to bring social security (for old age and illness) for the artist into line with that of other occupational groups;
   - to devise fiscal measures which take account of the special situation of art and artists;
   - to extend and develop the system of grants and other forms of support for artists;
   - to recognise the advantages of independent organisations on which artists may be invited to serve for a term;
   - to intensify the participation of artists also in the early stages of architectural and town planning and in shaping the environment;
   - to encourage artists to co-operate closely with non-professionals, for example, amateur musicians or artists;
   - to encourage artists to involve themselves more closely in educational work.

2. Emphasis is given to the importance of carrying out scientific surveys of the social and economic situation of the artist.

3. It is recommended that note should be taken of Resolution 624, adopted in 1976 by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, on the democratic renewal of the performing arts.

4. The draft resolutions finally address a recommendation to the Council of Europe to study the possibility of setting up a European system for the dissemination and exchange of cultural productions in the field of theatre, music and ballet, with a view to offering mobile artistic productions from all over Europe to cities, communes and other interested bodies.

Address by Mr H. F. van Aal on Theme IV, Minister of French Culture, Belgium

As you are aware, the plenary session discussion on Theme IV took place only this morning and the Committee had work over the lunch hour.

The Committee proposes three draft resolutions [1]. They aim at an intensification of cultural co-operation within the framework of the Convention, the Fund and a single autonomous body guaranteeing full participation by the Assembly. Furthermore, it is necessary to stress the compatibility of the conclusions of he Committee with those of Resolution 1, which established the terms of reference for a socio-cultural policy.

I would like very briefly to give you the main points of the three draft resolutions 6, 7 and 8.

The 8th deals with migrant workers, who have made an important contribution to the economic development of Europe. In view of this the Ministers are invited to affirm their desire to see co-operation established between the countries concerned by means of bilateral and multilateral agreements in order to ensure the continuity of migrants' links with their own cultures, and the enrichment of the national culture by contributions from the migrants' cultures.

Draft Resolution No. 7 covers the dissemination of information and recommends that the Council of Europe should devote more of its resources to keeping member states informed, in three ways: by collecting information from the national ministries concerned, by analysing new experiments, and by circulating the information collected with the help of a network of qualified correspondents.

Draft Resolution No. 6 is a little longer and notes first of all that cultural co-operation has at its disposal a legal basis in the Cultural

1. Adopted as 6, 7 and 8.

Convention, a Cultural Fund fed from various sources and a single body for the application of the Convention and the management of the Fund, namely the Council for Cultural Co-operation. This single body enjoys full autonomy as regards planning, implementing and evaluating its programme. It covers the interdependent fields of culture and sport and guarantees participation by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in its proceedings. The draft resolution goes on to say that the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs consider that they ought to exert a direct influence on the definition of problem areas and the choice of the main lines of European cultural co-operation. Finally, this draft resolution advocates, among the working methods, one of which I have already mentioned, namely the pooling – I repeat pooling – of innovatory experiments and the carrying out of co-ordinated studies and experiments in all the states signatory to the Cultural Convention or of special projects involving only a group of states financing the project themselves.

CLOSING SPEECH

CLOSING SPEECH
by
Mr K. Egeland, Minister of Church and Education, Norway

Assessments of this Conference will, of course, vary according to personal expectations. For those who thought we should and would easily set up a bunch of fixed rules for a single, correct cultural policy home and abroad – for these the Conference surely has been a disappointment. But I can hardly believe anybody in a responsible position came here with such an expectation. It is easy, and a common sport, to ridicule much or most of what goes on during conferences like this one. It is particularly tempting to maintain that words flow in abundance whereas concrete facts are few. This is not totally wrong nor totally ill-willed. However, the point is this: How should and could we deal with matters which allow themselves to be defined and sorted out only with difficulty? If culture was easily explained, if rules for it could be laid down, there would hardly be any need for constantly wrestling with what it is, how it is implemented and how it can be improved. As culture is the very question of quality of life, it goes without saying that the word as well as the reality behind it is under constant scrutiny. Culture has its historic foundation and framework, its roots and its self-evident aspects and values, but it refuses easy explanations and it totally rejects a designation once and for all.

This Conference, I find, will go down in history as one of consolidation – we have to a great extent passed from general phraseology to dealing with specific problems. Over the past decades the social function and the social context of culture has come into the foreground. There is nothing new in this, but it is there as a common challenge more now than ever before, perhaps. It is no small thing that all countries represented here have, I feel, declared their interest in widening the possibilities of benefitting from traditional culture – you could also call it élite culture. We probably all agree that traditionally

accepted values in arts, fiction and knowledge should be a right for as many people as possible to personally share in.

Less unanimity exists, perhaps, as to the dimensions and content of the term and the concept of culture. Voices have been raised, stressing the importance of supporting amateur activity or animation or a richer and better social life as **the** cultural policy of our time. According to this view, the challenge is above all to improve possibilities for men and women to live a full human life economically, socially and politically. In itself, that will also further a richer and fuller cultural life for society as a whole. Others have warned against the devaluation of notions and words when and if, to put this very brutally, the word culture is applied to all and anything. This point of view stresses the cultural heritage and the everlasting values in traditional culture. Particular mention should be made in an attempted summing up such as this, of the lively and committed discussions on the need to bear in mind the reality and the indispensibility of spiritual values. Some representatives have advocated a position accepting both the established and accepted cultural values **and** a widening of both the notion of culture and the obligation of cultural policy in a changing world – accepting both these without seeing any conflict here.

The Conference has passed a series of recommendations and resolutions; they are self-explanatory, and at the same time, they speak of a situation which is more or less universal. I refer now to the challenge to responsible political authorities to adopt cultural reforms as primary goals for official policy. That again means to invest more money in culture. We agree on this as a political issue of high priority. We are all aware that the creative arts are not only important, but indispensible. Creative artists should therefore be given such encouragement and support as is possible and feasible.

The Conference, consisting overwhelmingly of men, which is not unusual in such conferences, should make serious efforts to see the situation of women as a cultural problem, and of women artists as a special problem. This is one of the questions raised but not, perhaps, adequately dealt with, for cultural development also aims at creating better conditions for women in general.

A further problem calling for daring and adequate solutions is that of securing elementary cultural rights and opportunities for minorities and other underprivileged groups. Children are mentioned as a special group who should have better access to the cultural heritage. In addition, they have their own culture and we, the adults, should understand and accept the fact.

Overall, the Conference has been useful, particularly by stimulating an interchange of opinions on the approach to very difficult and often diffuse problems. Practical studies of systems of cultural policies from country to country have been our sources. We have also seen and learnt, if we did not know it beforehand, that cultural policies and cultural politics are indissolubly connected with tradition, heritage and socio-economic systems in each country. So there is neither possibility nor reason to export or import systems or situations or to copy wholesale from any country. We must each find our own solution, but in so doing we shall bear in mind the opinions and examples seen here. External stimulus is the very atmosphere in which cultural progress breathes and thrives.

But life and blood come from within, and are woven intrinsically into the present historical situation of each country. Thus, the integration mentioned by many speakers may, in practical terms, mean integration with certain neighbours in the spheres of responsibility and administration.

I hope that the Conference will prove to have encouraged the political will for co-operation and consultation between the Ministers responsible for cultural affairs. This political will should ensure stronger and more coherent co-operation in cultural affairs within Europe.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

RESOLUTION No. 1

on "the challenge to cultural policy in our changing society".

The European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

CONSIDERING that the challenge to cultural policy in our changing society calls for public action of various kinds in the cultural sphere, and that governments have come gradually over the past decade to realise the need for a carefully worked-out and coherent cultural policy as an essential part of policy as a whole;

BEARING IN MIND the rapid nature of the changes which our societies are undergoing, based on the effects, inter alia, of industrialisation, urbanisation, generalised education, the mass media, etc., and the resulting upheavals in family life, traditional values, religious beliefs, etc.;

CONSIDERING that the growth produced by industrial civilisation has not had as a concomitant a qualitative improvement in society, and that there is a need for a renewed respect for individual liberty and human values;

AWARE OF THE FACT THAT inequalities of an educational, economic, social and regional nature continue to exist with pernicious effects on cultural policy, so that some people are not able to make creative use of increasing economic welfare and leisure time and thus benefit from the measures taken by public authorities in the past;

CONSIDERING that many sections of society feel themselves excluded from taking an active role in the cultural life of the communities, and feel isolated and rejected;

AWARE of the dangers which various commercial pressures can have for the intellectual development of individuals and the growth of national cultures;

CONSCIOUS that the mass media can lead to a growing uniformity of products and taste and to a passive attitude;

CONSCIOUS that the aesthetic environment is seriously affected by a number of economic factors, so that its neglect and decay is a pressing problem.

ADOPT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES FOR CULTURAL POLICY:

I. Policy for society as a whole should have a cultural dimension stressing the development of human values, equality, democracy and the improvement of the human condition, in particular by guaranteeing freedom of expression and creating real possibilities for making use of this freedom.

II. Cultural policy should be regarded as an indispensable part of governmental responsibility and should be worked out in conjunction with policies for education, leisure and recreation and sport, the environment, social affairs, town planning, etc.

III. Cultural policy can no longer limit itself exclusively to taking measures for the development, promotion and popularisation of the arts; an additional dimension is now needed which by recognising the plurality of our societies, reinforces respect for individual dignity, spiritual values and the rights of minority groups and their cultural expressions.

In such a cultural democracy, special efforts must be made on behalf of disadvantaged and hitherto underprivileged groups in society.

IV. There should be an innovatory aspect in cultural policy and encouragement for the development of a wide range of new socio-cultural activities so that all may take an active part in the cultural life of their community with a view, inter alia, to helping bridge differences between generations.

V. It is necessary to promote the development of "outreaching" cultural activities, e.g. for people in sparsely populated or rural areas, at work-places, etc. and ensure the provision of adequate facilities for these activities, e.g. by encouraging the use of new distribution channels, promoting new techniques and in ensuring a wide range of local premises, both specially provided and through the use of libraries, schools, halls, etc.

VI. Cultural policy has a most important educational element, and must encourage, in particular, new ways of allowing children to exercise their creative talents and thus to ensure a full development of their cultural potential, and a new aesthetic sensibility to the environment.

VII. It is important to encourage a more critical understanding of the products of the mass media, and to ensure that there is a wide range

of choice, with opportunities for access to communication in the various media.

VIII. Cultural policy also has a special responsibility to counteract the negative effects of commercialised production of mass culture, e.g. by offering alternatives based on quality, by ensuring a wide range of products and by using more fully the native resources of each cultural community.

RESOLUTION No. 2

on "cultural policy as an instrument for improving the quality of life in town and country communities"

The European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo, on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

AWARE of the variety of local administration in the member states as well as of the differing relationships between local, regional and central governments in the various countries;

CONVINCED, however, of the real, practical opportunities which effective and democratic cultural policy at the local level, as part of general societal policy, offers for people in general to have free access to culture and to participate actively in it (cultural democracy);

DESIROUS that local authorities should be provided with as wide powers as possible of initiation and execution so that they may pursue an active cultural policy in town and country communities;

BEARING IN MIND the reports specially prepared by the CCC for the Conference (**The Demystification of Culture: Animation and Creativity** by Finn Jor, **Cultural Policy in Towns** by Stephen Mennel and **Towards Cultural Democracy** by J. A. Simpson), the results so far achieved in the CCC's projects on socio-cultural community development and the 14 towns, and the experiences and new ideas concerning the organisation of cultural activities at the local level presented in these studies;

RECOMMEND to participating governments the following ways in which cultural policy may be used as an instrument for improving the quality of life in town as well as country communities;

– encouraging local and regional authorities to assume an increasing responsibility for working out and implementing a policy for culture, to build up the necessary administrative machinery and to devote the necessary financial resources for this;

– providing premises for cultural activities, including the greater multipurpose use of existing buildings, and the opportunities provided by integrated conservation, in accordance with the Amsterdam Declaration;

– ensuring the availability of sufficient and appropriately trained manpower for the promotion of amateur artistic activities and other cultural and socio-cultural work at the local level;

– encouraging and helping the cultural activities of local voluntary organisations;

– investigating the opportunities for using the mass media, such as regional and local radio and television networks, as a tool of cultural policy;

EMPHASISE that cultural policy at the local level should particularly aim at:

– allowing all sections of the population to be involved in the processes of change which affect them by means of a coherent policy for socio-cultural community development;

– giving attention to such forms of cultural activities as emerge from regional and local needs and traditions and which encourage the community identity;

– a variety of adequate measures intended to activate those groups who have difficulties in participating in cultural activities (for example, migrant workers, handicapped people, persons living in scarcely populated regions and shift workers);

– supporting cultural activities among young people, increasing the supply of high quality culture for them and improving arts education;

– adopting and encouraging innovatory and experimental techniques and forms of cultural activities;

RECOMMEND, as regards some of the priority areas for future intergovernmental co-operation in this field,

– further work on socio-cultural community development with a view to improving policies on the basis of an evaluation of preliminary efforts made by governments in this field;

– further work on the study of cultural development policies at the local level, using where appropriate the successful model of the 14 towns project;

– the study of ways and means of establishing a system for the exchange, at a European level, of information on socio-cultural

community development projects, and on items of interest to cultural policy makers at the local level;

– study of ways and means of further developing systems enabling cultural workers and animateurs, and those who train them, to spend part of their training period abroad.

RESOLUTION No. 3

on "culture and the child"

The Conference of European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

BEARING IN MIND THEIR INTENTION

– of widening access to culture and encouraging participation in cultural life by all people,

– of paying increased attention to groups who have hitherto been neglected in this respect,

– of taking measures to counteract the abuses of commercialism,

RECOGNISING

– that children form a distinct group and consequently have special cultural needs of their own,

– that these cultural needs should be given the attention they warrant in national cultural policies,

– that, apart from the responses which children themselves have always found, their cultural requirements have mainly been catered for by commercial cultural products,

NOTING

– that a cultural policy for children is not an issue which can be dealt with in isolation but that it must be integrated in cultural development policy as a whole,

– that one of the overriding aims of this policy – to stimulate the development of every individual so that he may take a part in the life of the community – has a special significance in relation to the age of childhood,

– that organisations for young people are useful when elaborating policies concerning children so that they themselves may participate in this process,

and

– that many countries are on the verge of formulating policies concerning the cultural development of children,

RECOMMEND that within the framework of European cultural co-operation the member states should exchange experiences and ideas, in particular with regard to:

I. the creation both in educational and cultural institutions and elsewhere of conditions favourable to the development of children's creative abilities and of opportunities for self-expression;

II. the encouragement of the creation of works of art which contribute to a more varied supply of cultural products and services for children in all artistic fields;

III. ensuring a wide dissemination of these products through provision of appropriate distribution channels and of suitable working conditions for artists, teachers and other people involved.

RESOLUTION No. 4

on "fostering artistic creation"

The European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

CONSIDERING that any cultural policy seeking to meet the challenge posed by a rapidly changing society must be linked to the development of creativity and the fostering of artistic creation,

CONSIDERING, on the one hand, the importance of encouraging every citizen to express himself, to communicate and to be creative from an early age,

CONSIDERING, on the other hand, the importance of enabling artists to contribute to this wider development and to make an impact on the environment,

CONSIDERING the need to be sure of the quality of the art offered to the public,

CONSIDERING the need to provide the best possible conditions for the creation of works of art,

BELIEVING that the artistic life ought to be closely bound up with social life in other sectors, though with no loss of freedom or independence to the artist,

NOTING that the circumstances under which most artists work still prevent them from enjoying the same social and legal conditions, the same living conditions and standards of living as other workers,

CONSIDERING, finally, that the improvement of this situation must be part of the policy of a cultural democracy which includes the protection of the freedom of expression, the encouragement of innovation and the integration of art in everyday life,

the MINISTERS RESOLVE to encourage the following lines of action:

I. better use by the various sectors of society of the services and works which artists can provide, without forgetting, however, the nature of their vocation,

II. better and more diversified remuneration for these services and works (e.g. remuneration for participation in social, educational and cultural activity in the broad sense, additional opportunities to secure commissions and employment) and recourse to contractual arrangements whenever the artist's work is at stake,

III. bringing the welfare, unemployment and pension rights of professional artists as far as possible into line with those of other categories of workers, while paying due regard to the special conditions of creative work in the arts,

IV. tax provisions allowing for the specific features of artistic production,

V. implementing and extending schemes for grants and other kinds of support for artists, especially for those working in fields which preclude them from earning sufficient immediate income,

VI. recognising the advantages of specialist agencies independent of governments whose members include artists and are appointed for limited periods,

VII. associating artists with urban and architectural projects from their inception as well as with work to improve the environment, and particularly the work environment,

VIII. encouraging artists to work in collaboration with a variety of social groups,

IX. devoting more time to artistic and aesthetic subjects in schools and training courses as well as in adult education and making the public more aware of the contribution that art in all its forms can make to the quality of life,

X. improving the possibilities for artists' participation in all levels of teaching establishments and in all leisure activities,

XI. taking measures to counteract the use of art for purposes of speculative dealing.

AGREE further that it would be interesting to conduct scientific inquiries into the socio-economic conditions of the life of artists,

TAKE NOTE of Resolution 624 (1976) of the Parliamentary Assembly on the democratic renewal of the performing arts according to the following general principles:

a. the performing arts should be made more available, more accessible, and more relevant to the creative development of society;

b. the people should be encouraged to play a more active role in this;

c. means should be sought of developing the participation of performing artists in all questions relating to their professional occupation;

d. the state should take both art and the people into account in its urgently needed support for the survival of freedom of cultural expression in Western Europe;

e. the performing arts are particularly dependent for their continued existence on such state support,

RECOMMEND that the Council of Europe continues its study of the subject of public aid to foster artistic creation and to carry out similar studies successively in regard to music, literature, cinema, photography, television and architecture.

RESOLUTION No. 5

on "artistic dissemination"

The European Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

BELIEVING that the wealth of creative theatre, music, ballet and plastic and audio-visual art in the various countries of Europe ought not to remain jealously guarded behind frontiers that do not exist in the world of culture but should, on the contrary, be available to all the towns in Europe which wish to enjoy it;

RESOLVE to give consideration to an art dissemination scheme whose function would be to offer towns and institutions in the various countries a free choice of artistic performances or exhibitions from all over Europe as could be transported at a reasonable cost;

RECOMMEND that the Council of Europe investigate, in conjunction with the French Government means of extending to the rest of Europe the current experiment by the existing "Office de Diffusion Artistique", which has already begun to perform this function.

RESOLUTION No. 6

on "European cultural co-operation"

The European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

WHEREAS the problems of formulating and developing cultural policies and of managing cultural affairs are similar in most European countries and call for mutual consultation, co-operation and the exchange of information;

RECOGNISING the variety of instruments of international cultural co-operation;

WELCOMING the fact that a European body exists which meets the specific needs of the states signatory to the European Cultural Convention;

The Ministers

CONSIDER that they ought to exert a direct influence on the definition of problem areas and the choice of the main lines of cultural co-operation;

RESOLVE to meet periodically within the framework of the European Cultural Convention, continuing the special relationship with the Council of Europe, in order to take such further steps to co-operate as may seem appropriate, to review the progress of work undertaken in pursuance of their earlier resolutions and to co-ordinate their own action with that of international organisations and ministerial conferences working in the same field;

RESOLVE to ensure at national level the co-ordination necessary for European cultural co-operation;

RECOMMEND that the CCC devote a greater part of its cultural programme to cultural co-operation, giving it its proper socio-cultural

dimension as defined in Resolution No. 1, perfecting methods of co-ordinating cultural policy proper with policies in the other sectors of social life, and ensuring that the results of the research and experiments carried out are made known to the member states signatory to the convention and among the people interested;

ADVOCATE among the working methods which seem to them most profitable:

- the carrying out of co-ordinated studies and experiments in all the states signatory to the Cultural Convention or of special projects involving only a group of states financing the project themselves;
- the pooling of innovatory experiments;

NOTE WITH SATISFACTION that European cultural co-operation has at its disposal:

- a legal basis: the Cultural Convention, open to accession by countries not members of the Council of Europe;
- a Cultural Fund fed from various sources;
- a single body for the application of the Convention and the management of cultural affairs: the CCC, which
  - exercises its autonomy in planning, implementing and evaluating its programme;
  - concerns itself with the interdependent fields of education, culture and sport;
  - guarantees full participation by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in its various bodies;

AFFIRM, in conclusion, their determination to intensify their co-operation.

RESOLUTION No. 7

on the "dissemination of information"

The European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

NOTHING WITH SATISFACTION the considerable achievements of the Council of Europe over the past ten years, particularly in regard to the architectural heritage, cultural "animation", the use of the mass media for cultural purposes and, more generally, the management of cultural affairs;

REGRETTING that the information about this work which reaches cultural authorities at all levels is not commensurate with its

importance, so that no profit is derived from management techniques, successful experiments or the results of much thinking in common, despite the many new ventures that have been embarked upon in various countries;

RECOMMEND that the Council of Europe devote more of its resources to keeping member states informed:

– by collecting systematically from the national ministries concerned all the relevant information, and particularly statistics, concerning the management of cultural affairs and collating the documentation thus collected;

– by analysing new experiments, especially in connection with new communication media, cultural action in schools and decentralised cultural "animation";

– by circulating the information collected immediately in the form of a set of brief periodical bulletins and other attractively presented literature, with the help of a network of qualified correspondents.

RESOLUTION No. 8

on "migrant workers"

The European Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting at Oslo on 15, 16 and 17 June 1976,

RECOGNISING that in the course of the past 20 years migrant workers have made a large contribution to Europe's economic development and constitute new cultural communities inside Europe;

POINTING OUT that everything possible must be done to create the conditions which will give everyone free access to culture;

OBSERVING that with regard to the cultural life of migrant workers present conditions are far from meeting their needs;

AFFIRM their desire to see co-operation established between the countries interested by means of bilateral and multilateral agreements in order to ensure the continuity of migrants' links with their own cultures, the enrichment of the national culture by contributions from the migrants' cultures, and participation by migrants in the culture of their host countries;

RECOMMEND that the competent Council of Europe bodies take up this question.

(abstention: The Netherlands)

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

DELEGATES

Austria

Dr. Fritz HERRMANN
Dr. Herbert OPPOLZER
Ministerialrat

Belgium

(Culture française)

M. H. F. VAN AAL
Ministre de la Culture française

M. M. HICTER
Directeur général de la Jeunesse et des Loisirs

M. J. L. LUXEN
Chef de Cabinet du Ministre de la Culture française

M. H. POUSSEUR
Directeur du Conservatoire Royal de Musique de Liège

(Culture néerlandaise)

Madame R. DE BACKER-VAN OCKEN
Ministre de la culture néerlandaise

M. Johan FLEERACKERS
Chef de Cabinet,
Ministère de la Culture néerlandaise

M. Jules ALBRECHTS
Conseiller
Cabinet du Ministre de la Culture néerlandaise

M. CLAES
Rédacteur du journal Gazet van Antwerpen

M. Leo SCHEVENHELS
Directeur de l'Administration des Relations
Culturelles Internationales

M. Etienne HUYSENTRUYT
Conseiller-Chef de Service de l'Administration
des Relations Culturelles Internationales

Cyprus

Dr. Andreas MIKELLIDES
Minister of Education

Mr Panagiotis SERGHIS
Cultural Officer

Denmark

Mr Niels MATTHIASEN
Minister for Cultural Affairs

Mr Ole PERCH NIELSEN
Permanent Under Secretary, Ministry of Cultural Affairs

Mr W. WEINCKE
Head of Department, Ministry of Cultural Affairs

Mr Jørgen HARDER RASMUSSEN
Head of Department, Ministry of Cultural Affairs

Mr Niels-Jørgen NIELSEN
Head of Section, Ministry of Cultural Affairs

Finland

Mr Kalevi KIVISTÖ
Minister of Education

Mr Jakko NUMMINEN
Head of Chancellery

Mr Risto KIVELA
Secretary for Cultural Affairs

Ms Marjatta OKSANEN
Referendary

Mr Ilmari TUOMAINEN
Secretary of Embassy

Mr Ismo PORNA
Secretary for Cultural Affairs
Association of Finnish Towns

Mr Lassi NUMMI
Author

France

M. Michel GUY
Secrétaire d'Etat à la Culture

M. Patrick IMHAUS
Conseiller des Affaires Etrangères, Adjoint au Chef des Services de la Diffusion Culturelle

M. Jacques DEPAIGNE
Conseiller des Affaires Etrangères,
Conseiller technique au Cabinet du Secrétariat d'Etat

Mlle Françoise BELLAIGUE
Conseiller technique au Cabinet du Secrétaire d'Etat

M. Augustin GIRARD
Chef du Service des Etudes et de la Recherche

Mme Raymonde MOULIN
Directeur de Recherche
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

M. Pierre IMHAUS
Chargé de Mission

Mme Odette GUITARD
Conseiller Culturel de l'Ambassade de France

Federal Republic of Germany

Dr. Karl MOERSCH
Staatssekretär im Auswärtigen Amt

Dr. HIERONYMUS
Ministerialrat

Dr. Herman GLASER
Schul- und Kulturreferat, Stadt Nürnberg

Dr. Norbert KLINGLER
Legationsrat

Greece

Mr Constantin TRYPANIS (Vice-President)
Ministre de la Culture et des Sciences

Mr Georges MARANGHIDES
Directeur général des Affaires Culturelles

M. Jean PESMAZOGLOU
Ambassadeur de Grèce à Copenhague accrédité en Norvège

M. K. KERAMEUS
Professeur à l'Université de Thessalonique

Holy See

S. E. Monseigneur Giuseppe ZABKAR
Pro-Nonce Apostolique en Finlande et Délégué Apostolique en Scandinavie

M. l'Architecte Thomas THIIS-EVENSEN
Président du Conseil Diocésain pour l'Art Sacré à Oslo

Iceland

Mr Birgir THORLACIUS
Secretary General, Ministry of Culture and Education

Ireland

Mr Richard BURKE, TD
Minister of Education

Mr Liam O'LAIDHIN
Under-Secretary, Dept. of Education

Mr Richard STOKES
Principal Officer, Dept. of Education

Miss Margaret HENNESSY
First Secretary, Dept. of Foreign Affairs

Italy

M. Gherardo CORNAGGIA MEDICI CASTIGLIONI
Ambassadeur, Représentant Permanent de l'Italie auprès du Conseil de l'Europe

Dr. Paolo TERNI
Secrétaire Scientifique du Comité Culturel de la Commission Nationale de l'UNESCO

Dr. Roberto di LEO
Chargé d'Affaires, Ambassade d'Oslo

Professeur Italo ANGLE
Chef du Bureau des Etudes et de la recherche, Ministère des Biens Culturels et de l'Environnement

Luxembourg

M. Robert KRIEPS
Ministre des Affaires Culturelles

M. Raymond WEBER
Professeur-attaché au Ministère des Affaires culturelles

M. Pierre PUTH
Professeur, animateur de "Jeunesses Théâtrales"

M. Jos. WAMPACH
Administrateur du Théâtre Municipal d'Esch-sur-Alzette

Netherlands

Mr L. B. VAN OMMEN
Deputy Director-General for Adult Education and Recreation
Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Welfare

Mr C. C. ECKHART
Head of the Central Division of International Relations
Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Welfare

Mr Th. VAN VELZEN
Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Welfare

Mr P. J. YPERLAAN
Director of Museums, Monuments and Archives
Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Welfare

Mr E. VAN HEYST
Head of European Co-operation Division
Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Welfare

Norway

Mr Kjølv EGELAND (Chairman)
Minister of Church and Education

Ms Kari GJESTEBY
Permanent Secretary of State

Mr Halvdan SKARD
Permanent Secretary of State

Mr Johs. AANDERAA
Director General
Department of Cultural Affairs,
Ministry of Church and Education

Mr Leif J. WILHELMSEN
Director General
Ministry of Church and Education

Ms Ingeborg LYCHE
Director

M. Guttorm GRØNNINGSAETER
Norwegian Cultural Council

Ms A. M. FEIVEIT

Mr Hartvig KIRAN
Head of Cultural Dept.,
Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation

Ms Helene ANDERSEN
Head of Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Lennart ROSENLUND
Lecturer, University of Stavanger

Portugal

M. David MOURAO FERREIRA
Secrétaire d'Etat à la Culture

M. Joao LOPES SERRADO
Chef de Division des Relations Culturelles Extérieures
Secrétariat d'Etat à la Culture

M. João PALMA FERREIRA

Spain

M. Carlos ROBLES PIQUER
Ministre de l'Education et de la Science

M. Gabriel CANADAS
Vice-Ministre de l'Information et du Tourisme

M. Antonio LAGO
Directeur Général du Patrimoine Artistique et Culturel

M. J. A. VACA DE OSMA
Sous-Directeur Général des Relations Culturelles
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

M. Juan DE LUIS CAMBLOR
Sous-Directeur Général de la Coopération Internationale
Ministère de l'Education et de la Science

M. J. ENTRAMBASGUAS
Sous-Directeur Général de Promotion Editoriale
Ministère de l'Information et du Tourisme

M. Alvaro DELAGADO
Artiste-Peintre

Sweden

Mr Bertil ZACHRISSON
Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs

Mr Gunnar SVENSSON
Head of the Department for Cultural Affairs
Ministry of Education

Mr Carl-Johan KLEBERG
Head of the Research Division
National Council for Cultural Affairs

Ms Leni BJØRKLUND
Head of Section, Cultural Affairs
Ministry of Education

Mr Jan-Olof GURINDER
Head of Section, Cultural Affairs
Ministry of Education

Ms Silja STRØMBERG
Head of Section, International Affairs
Ministry of Education

Mr Bernt JONSSON
Information Secretary

Switzerland

M. Ludwig VON MOOS
Ancien Conseiller fédéral

M. Max ALTORFER
Directeur de l'Office fédéral des affaires culturelles

M. Gerhard M. SCHUWEY
Adjoint à l'Office fédéral des affaires culturelles

M. Eugen EGGER
Secrétaire Général de la Conférence des Directeurs
Cantonaux de l'Instruction publique, Genève

Mme Louise GIRARDIN
Adjoint au Maire de la ville de Genève

M. Paul STAUFFER
Chef de la section des affaires culturelles et de l'UNESCO

Turkey

M. Rifki DANISMAN
Ministre de la Culture

M. C. S. HAYTA
Ambassadeur de la République Turque en Norvège

Prof. Dr. Emin BILGIC
Sous-Secrétaire d'Etat du Ministère de la Culture

M. Necip INCELER
Directeur de Département des Relations
Extérieures du Ministère de la Culture

United Kingdom

Lord DONALDSON
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
(Minister with special responsibility for the Arts)
Department of Education and Science

Ms Mary GILES
Private Secretary to the Minister for the Arts

Mr G. J. SPENCE
Under-Secretary,
Arts Branch,
Department of Education and Science

Mr Roy SHAW
Secretary General, Arts Council of Great Britain

Mr D. E. JACKSON
H. M. Inspector,
Scottish Education Department

Mr A. C. BROOK
Permanent Secretary,
Department of Education and Science,
(Northern Ireland)

Mr M. MOSS
External Relations Branch,
Department of Education and Science

Mr William WOOD
British Council

Mr MACARTNEY
Foreign and Commonwealth Office

OBSERVERS

Liechtenstein

Mr George MALIN
Regierungsrat

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
(Committee on Culture and Education)

Mr Franz KARASEK, Chairman, (Austria)

Mr Jacob AANO, Vice-Chairman, (Norway)

Chairman of the Council for Cultural Co-operation

M. Charles HUMMEL
Délégué Permanent de la Suisse auprès de l'Unesco

Conference of Regional and Local Authorities of Europe

M. Louis ESCANDE
Maire de Macon,
Macon,
France

UNESCO

Mr E. POUCHPA DASS
Director of the Division of Cultural Development

Commission of the European Communities

Mr R. GREGOIRE
Head of Division, General Directorate for Research in Science and Education

Secretariat for Nordic Cultural Co-operation

Mr Klas OLOFSSON
Director of the Secretariat

Mr Bjørn SKAU

SECRETARY OF THE CONFERENCE

Mr Georg KAHN-ACKERMANN
Secretary General of the Council of Europe

INDEX OF SPEECHES

Page

Mr. K. Egeland – Norway 11
Mr. G. Kahn-Ackermann – Council of Europe 15
Mr. F. Karasek – Parliamentary Assembly 19
Mr. Pouchpa Dass – Unesco 21

Theme I

Mr. B. Zachrisson – Sweden 25
Mr. L. van Moos – Switzerland 31
Mgr. Zabkar – Holy See 34
Mr. K. Kivistö – Finland 36
Lord Donaldson – UK 39
Dr. K. Moersch – Federal Republic of Germany 42
Mr. C. Robles – Spain 44
Mr. N. Matthiasen – Denmark 48
Mr. M. Guy – France 51
Mr. D. Mourao Ferreira – Portugal 54

Theme II

Mrs. R. de Backer van Ocken – Belgium 59
Mr. L. Wilhelmsen – Norway 67
Mrs. L. Björklund – Sweden 70
Mr. R. Burke – Ireland 73
Mr. R. Krieps – Luxembourg 77
Mr. L. Escande – Conference of Regional and Local Authorities of Europe 79

Page

Theme III

Mr. M. Guy – France 85
Mr. G. Svensson – Sweden 91
Mr. K. Egeland – Norway 94
Mr. H. Pousseur – Belgium 96
Mr. R. Shaw – United Kingdom 99
Mr. M. Guy – France 102

Theme IV

Mr. G. Cornaggia Medici Castiglioni – Italy 109
Mr. H.-F. Van Aal – Belgium 115
Mr. R. Krieps – Luxembourg 118
Mr. R. Grégoire – EEC 120
Mr. N. Inceler – Turkey 122
Mr. B. Zachrisson – Sweden 124
Mr. K. Kivistö – Finland 127
Mr. C. Hummel – Chairman of the CCC 128

Closing session

Lord Donaldson – United Kingdom 133
Mr. K. Kivistö – Finland 135
Dr. K. Moersch – Federal Republic of Germany 138
Mr. H.-F. Van Aal – Belgium 141

Closing speech

Mr. K. Egeland – Norway 145
Resolutions 151

SALES AGENTS FOR PUBLICATIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

AUSTRIA
Gerold & Co.
Graben 31
Vienna, 1

DENMARK
Ejnar Munksgaard
Nörregade 6
Copenhagen

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY
Verlag Dr Hans Heger
Goethestraße 54, Postfach 821
D-53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg

GREECE
Librairie Kauffmann
28, rue Stadiou
Athens

ICELAND
Snaebjörn Jonsson & Co. A.F.
The English Bookshop
Hafnarstroeti 9
Reykjavik

IRELAND
Stationery Office
Dublin

ITALY
Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni
Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella Post 552
Florence

NETHERLANDS
N. V. Martinus Nijhoff
Lange Voorhout, 9
The Hague

NEW ZEALAND
Government Printing Office
Mulgrave Street
(Private Bag)
Wellington

SPAIN
Libros S.A. Mundi-Prensa
Castelló 37
E-Madrid 1

SWEDEN
Aktiebolaget C. E. Fritze
Kungl. Hovbokhandel
Fredsgatan 2
Stockholm

SWITZERLAND
Buchhandl. Hans Raunhardt
Kirchgasse 17
8000 Zurich 1

Librairie Payot
6, rue Grenus
1211 Geneva 11

TURKEY
Librairie Hachette
469, Istiklal Caddesi
Beyoglu
Istanbul

UNITED KINGDOM
H. M. Stationery Office
P. O. Box 569, London S. E. 1

UNITED STATES
Manhattan Publishing Company
225, Lafayette Street
New York, 10012 — N. Y.

STRASBOURG
Librairie Berger-Levrault
Place Broglie